



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

40.

902.





SKETCHES IN DIVINITY.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

(SOME OUT OF PRINT.)

1. HISTORY of the ENGLISH CHURCH and SECTS. 4 vols. 2l. 12s.
2. SERMONS. 10s. 6d. 1811.
3. A MANUAL of RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE. 5s. 6d.
4. SACRED HOURS. 7s.
5. ARABIA; a Poem. 5s.
6. GOD IS LOVE. 2s. 6d.
7. A MEMOIR of MISS F. A. BELL. 3s. 6d.
8. LENT LECTURES on the SEVEN LAST SENTENCES UTTERED
BY CHRIST. 5s.
9. EXERCISES for the HIGHER CLASSES of NATIONAL SCHOOLS.
1s. 9d. with Cards.
10. LENT LECTURES on the LAST THINGS. 5s.
11. LECTURES on LIBERALITY and EXPEDIENCE. 5s.
12. AN ENGLISH CALENDAR. On rollers, 7s.
13. SERMONS. 2 vols. 1l. 1s. 1836.
14. THE LORD'S PRAYER, in Poetical Version. 3d.
15. SABBATH a DELIGHT; a Tract. 3d.
16. A SHORT CATECHISM.

SKETCHES
IN
DIVINITY.

ADDRESSED TO
CANDIDATES FOR THE MINISTRY;

AND LIKEWISE INTENDED AS

A Sunday-Book for General Readers.

BY
THE REV. JOHNSON GRANT, M.A.
MINISTER OF KENTISH TOWN CHAPEL.

Οὐ εἰμὶ, ὁ καὶ λατρεύω.

ACTS xxvii. 23.

LONDON:
HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY;
C. J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD,
AND WATERLOO PLACE, Pall Mall;
JAMES DARLING, 22 LITTLE QUEEN STREET,
LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS.

1840.

902.



PREFACE.

EXAMINATIONS for orders, like qualifications for university degrees, have participated in the general improvements of the nineteenth century. Formerly, to be versed in the English Bible, to construe the Greek Testament, to explain and defend the Thirty-nine Articles, and to have read Paley's Evidences, Tomline's Theology, and a small number of other elementary books, was, for the most part, deemed sufficient to pass a man under the eyes of an examining chaplain. The present qualifications embrace a critical acquaintance with the best Greek and Latin classics,—a study of Hebrew,—a knowledge of all matters relating to the Jewish and Christian churches and sects,—together with a comprehensive range over Scripture history and doctrine, and, in short, over all subjects connected with an elucidation of the Bible.

Two small tracts on these subjects of examination have been lately set forth—one at Cambridge, and the other in Dublin—each containing three hundred questions, and exhibiting the requisites in religious knowledge demanded from candidates for the ministry, respectively, in the English and Irish churches. It struck me that an answer to these questions was desirable, and might prove useful, not only as an aid to the divinity-student, but as opening the minds and assisting the researches of general readers, whose attention may be directed to religious inquiries. I hesitated for some time which of the two books I should

take in hand, or whether I should select the least obvious questions in each ; but various considerations determined me at length in favour of the Cambridge questions. I had accomplished half my task, with much labour and early rising, in the midst of a laborious profession, and under a deep domestic calamity, when I learned that the author of the Questions had himself furnished a key for their solution ; and I had very nearly completed my plan before I could obtain that little treatise. Without attempting to disparage the writer, I found that his Key consisted of very short responses, and in many instances of simple references to common divinity-books,—Horne, Grotius, Paley, &c., but without giving sufficiently ample information on most of the subjects handled. I accordingly persisted in my original design, which was that of affording comprehensive views, though still under the name of “Sketches,” on the various important themes to which these questions had directed my investigation. The desultory and unconnected form in which the subjects are introduced, is owing to the author of the Questions. I have followed my guide ; though his course has been erratic. An Under-graduate has likewise published answers to the Questions ; but these I have not seen : to neither have I any obligations to acknowledge.

It is obvious that such inquiries, being published without authority, cannot be generally binding in any diocese, and well known that every Bishop circulates his own papers—nay, that fresh questions, for the most part, belong to every ordination. The various subjects, however, here proposed for discussion, may be taken as comprehending the general knowledge in divinity required in candidates for orders : and the object of these “Sketches” is, to assist the memory and to open the understanding

of students on all the topics of probable investigation, which may be either committed to paper, or brought forward in oral conference. Although the plan of the writer moves in a wider orbit than that proposed by the author of the Cambridge Key (a duodecimo tract of less than a hundred pages of large and open letter-press), the order of the answers is preserved, and their number registered. The author of the Key has furnished *short* answers to his own questions: the object of the "Sketches" is to furnish materials for the answer of almost any questions in divinity which an examining chaplain may propose.

That a learned and able clergy should be provided for the church, especially in its present endangered condition, is one of those means to which, under Providence, we must look for its support and existence as the pillar and ground of the truth. That a certain body of divines should be so highly learned as to be ever ready and able to come forth in defence either of the discipline or doctrine of that church, when assailed by scepticism or disturbed by schism, is likewise highly expedient; agreeably to the celebrated image sketched by Mr. Canning, and quoted by Dr. Chalmers, comparing these profound theologians to men-of-war laid up in ordinary, which seem to slumber at present, but rise up in their fury against any hostile attack. At the same time, I may be permitted humbly to doubt whether these high requisites and demands of polemical attainment are not, in most cases, carried too far, or dwelt on too exclusively, in examination. The great majority of persons ordained for the ministry are destined to pass their lives in obscure districts, and amongst simple peasants—a situation in which those intricate questions and difficult attainments can never be brought to bear without pedantry and even unintelligibility.

And this evil is not removed by that course of classical and scientific studies which usually precedes entrance on the ministry, and proficiency in which has little concern with the common functions of a parish-priest. A man is a wrangler, or obtains the honours of a first class, and is forthwith removed to a rural parish, where he has no one idea in common with his people, and has yet to learn their phrases, their manners, their prejudices, and the extent of their capacities. In intercourse even with the better classes, his knowledge of Greek or mathematics is but a poor compensation for his ignorance of country or parish matters; and, with respect to both high and low, though his scholarship begets respect, his profundity goes for nothing.

I should, therefore, have been better pleased, had the questions been less learned or technical, and if *some part* of the examinations had related, first, to the reading and understanding of the liturgy, and to the Scottish method of mandating—important points, and too much neglected. It would have been further desirable, that the topics of inquiry should have touched more on daily and commonplace occurrences, relating to the practical functions of the clerical profession. I shall offer a specimen of the questions to which I allude, as directing attention to the most useful attainments, and as “shewing (what I conceive to be) a more excellent way.”

1. How would you proceed when called to visit a sick person in a deplorable state of religious ignorance?

2. How would you correct the too prevalent opinion, that, in visiting the sick, you are come to work a charm on an impenitent sinner?

3. How would you check presumptuous assurance, and reduce it to lively and humble hope?

4. What texts would you cite in a case of one depressed by alarming views, which have been produced by fanatical guides?

5. How would you reply to a sceptic—not through vice, but through an obliquity of mind—who should say, in the language of Lord Byron, “I cannot make myself believe?”

6. Write out a prayer for such a sceptic.

7. How would you conduct yourself to a leading man in your parish, who is decent and charitable, and from whom your family have received many favours, but who is yet addicted to some irregularities, *e. g.* Sunday entertainments?

8. You will meet in company with men of the world who make light of doctrinal points, and, on the score of liberality, allow no distinction in the favour of God between a virtuous Socinian and an orthodox believer: how would you address such a person?

9. Write a letter of consolation to a parent bereft of his only child.

10. How would you soothe the alarms of a parishioner about to undergo a dangerous operation?

11. What line should a clergyman draw for himself in amusements, and in things called indifferent? Write your sentiments on self-denial in a minister, and on the appetites. What difference, in such matters, should there be between a clergyman and a decent layman?

12. What sacrifices ought a minister to make to avert litigation? and how far may he compromise the interests of his successor? Write an essay on worldly prudence as opposed to the duty of promoting the glory of God.

13. What are *fundamental* doctrines and duties?

14. To what extent is the imputed righteousness of

Christ to be stretched with reference to *wide* personal aberration from the right path, together with incomplete or late repentance, as distinct from pardon to the less heinous sinner and thorough *penitent* through Christ as a sacrifice? On degrees in future rewards and punishments.

15. On concessions towards Sectarists, and co-operation with them on common or neutral grounds.

16. On lay and *ministerial dissenting* baptism.

17. On the comparative advantages of savings-banks and benefit-clubs.

18. On the choice of visitors in district-visiting societies. Duties of a district-visitor, and the danger of injudicious counsel. On zeal and fanaticism in a visitor.

19. What definite ideas do you attach to the terms—grace, regeneration, faith, looking to Jesus, coming to Christ, communion with God, and God's changing the heart?

20. On preaching intelligibly and methodically.

21. On delicacy in preaching, and the difference between hints and plain speaking, and between remote allusions and homely figures, in a refined and in an ignorant congregation.

22. What influence may an unguarded exposition of the doctrines of free pardon and imputed righteousness exert on by-standers and relations of a person counselled or solaced on a dying bed?

23. What advice would you give when parties—man and wife—consult you as to their different religious persuasions, and as to the education of their children?

24. How far does the spirituality of the Gospel allow a relaxation in religious ordinances?

25. *Sordet in conspectu Judicis, quod fulget in conspectu operantis.*

26. Ought a minister to act as a magistrate?
27. How far ought a minister to take part in parochial concerns?
28. On ministerial interference in domestic differences or parochial squabbles. On peace-making and inter-meddling.
29. On cottage and prayer-meetings.
30. On the moral effects of pauperism.
31. On mendicity. On alms-giving and advice *obiter*.
32. On the vices peculiar to the lower orders, and their causes, remote and proximate, with the best preventives or remedies.
33. "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers. Be all things to all men." Write a comment on these passages.
34. On living in and above the world.
35. On the Lord's supper as a viaticum.
36. How would you reason with a thoughtless, rash, headstrong youth, as to the influences of his conduct on the cause of God, on his parents, on society, and on himself?
37. What is the duty of man with respect to sanctification, as a moral agent?
38. What is the meaning of the *opus operatum*?
39. What ground would you take in an argument with a Roman Catholic who should challenge you to a conference?
40. How do you overcome the geological difficulties as compared with the Mosaic dates and narrative? Are not the institution of the Sabbath, the doctrine of original sin, and universal redemption, dependent on the literal meaning of the Mosaic account?
41. On a personal God, as opposed to the *anima mundi*.

42. Defend a particular providence.

43. The intermediate state, against Whately's "Scripture Revelations."

44. The inadequacy of natural religion to give information on many important points, proves the necessity of revelation, and of ascertaining the truth of Scripture, as the only rock of reliance.

45. On recognition.

46. Topics of advice to the sick and dying.

47. Topics of consolation for general mourners.

48. On merited and unmerited loss of character.

Arguments to sufferers.

49. On loving the creature more than the Creator.

50. On guardian spirits.

51. On constant references to particular Providence; and on giving a religious turn to ordinary conversation.

These suggestions are thrown out, not to cast blame on the questions usually proposed, but in the hope of blending with them matters of a more practical tendency, in regard to which many who pass a brilliant examination in scholarship are often woefully ignorant.

Under-graduates in the universities are now in the habit of devoting part of their time to assisting the parochial ministry in their occasional duties; but this is an office in which youths, having the most zealous intentions, may both alarm and soothe injudiciously, and exceed moderation, without a discreet guide; and thus do more harm than good.

That the finishing part of a clerical education should consist in a year passed beneath the roof of a laborious parish-priest, whose sphere of duty is wide and multifarious, would be far more advisable. The student would

here accommodate and habituate himself to the regular hours, and sober habits, and family devotions of a religious household; and would learn, by accompanying the minister in his daily progress through his parish, a practical lesson of discretion, delicacy, and fidelity in the discharge of those occasional duties, which hardly any theoretical instructions in an university-course can be expected to convey.

One of the following questions relates to the geological theory of the creation; and, unhappily, or happily, not being convinced by the fashionable topics, I have leaned to the literal and old explanation of the first chapter of Genesis. The case is very different from the Copernican system, inasmuch as on this point, an important doctrine, a moral precept, the warrant for the strict observance of the Sabbath, depends. "And the evening and the morning were the first, second, third *day*:" and "in *six days*"—not six thousand years—"God created the heavens and the earth, and rested the seventh *day*, wherefore God blessed the *seventh day*, and hallowed it."

On this subject, let it not be forgotten, that all proceedings with which the Socialists desecrate the Sabbath, and outrage revelation, invariably open with a lecture on geology, in which the concessions of philosophers are triumphantly re-echoed, as if the foundations of revealed truth were shaken, and the authenticity of Scripture given up. Now, what are ingenious, and, to the geologists themselves, satisfactory explanations, are infidel sneers to the Socialists, and disheartening alarms to the great body of believers. Hence we are tempted to tremble for an edifice where the supporting pillars are thus shaken, and to exclaim with the Psalmist (Ps. xi. 3), "If the FOUN-

DATIONS (of our holy faith) be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

On these grounds, and on many others, I am inclined to think that there is some error in modern computation, and that the old and literal sense of Scripture may yet be found to be the true one.

To throw together the writer's doubts in one synoptical view; the deductions of the new science,

1st. Contradict the plain and literal account of Scripture.

2d. They produce a general scepticism, by shaking the first foundations of our faith.

3d. They destroy our grand obligation to observe the holy Sabbath.

4th. They have no support from collateral evidence, from written history, oral tradition, or monuments.

5th. They render it wholly unaccountable how the world should have existed for many ages under the dominion of animals utterly unintelligent, without one vestige of man, the being of reason and probation, for whom the world and its animals were made; for it is allowed that the few human fossil remains discovered are imbedded in matrices of recent formation, and tally with the received chronology of Scripture.

6th. Geology assumes chronologically that the same distance of time was necessary of old between one formation or deposition and another, which now elapses; while every thing proves a higher temperature in the earth,—expanding mosses into shrubs, and ferns into trees, and peopling northern countries with tropical animals; and this, even without making allowance for the agency of Omnipotence, and other circumstances of early date.

7th. The science of geology has confessedly many anomalies, which are awkwardly explained by guesses and "may-be's." It even conjures up the Atlantis of Plato from the deep, to furnish a deposit for the Wealden strata. Lyell's *Elements*, p. 363, and the whole of chap. xxv.

8th. The new science overthrows the scriptural doctrine, "that by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;" for it puts death before the existence of a man who *might* sin.

9th. There have been two other objections to the literal meaning of Scripture; the first derived from the alleged diversities of parent-stocks in the human race; and the second, from the difference of language in the world. These,—which would have overthrown the doctrine of one man's original sin and its consequences,—have been laid prostrate by a surer branch of science. The former was cleared up by Professor Smith of Philadelphia, in an answer to Lord Kaimes, and more fully by Dr. Pritchard in his *Physical History of Mankind*; and the latter by the admirable ethnographical lectures of Dr. Wiseman,—although indeed the well-known fact that man is universally the only cross-grained animal—the only animal whose instincts are opposite to the design of his creation—the only animal requiring reason, and gifted with it, to subdue or regulate his innate propensities—the only animal *invariably*, through *all his tribes*, hues, and diversities, depending (whether he knows it or not) on a superior influence, to draw him nearer to a fulfilment of the ends of his being; all thus proclaiming a common descent from one *parent* and *corrupted* stock;—this fact, I say, might have sufficiently explained the first objection; just as the confusion of tongues at Babel would itself

have answered the second. But this leads us to expect, that the geological interpretations now in vogue will in time prove equally untenable, and that revelation will triumph in its plain and literal sense.

Not writing a treatise on geology, however, I forbear to suggest any explanation of the phenomena insisted on, through the intervention of intermediate causes (although this might be done); since it is to the excess and extravagance of seeking to explain every thing by such causes, that much of the evil of the present day is owing. Philosophy has traced to secondary causes many phenomena which have hitherto been conceived to have sprung from the immediate agency of Omnipotence. Bold and daring in the pride of its power, may we not fear that it is pushing its researches too far, in attempting to explain miracles and extraordinary interpositions, solely by the established laws of nature. La Place is said to have hailed the approaching era, when no *primary* cause shall ever be sought for or mentioned. But a bound there *MUST* be to secondary causes; a point at which the seeker after them will be at a loss to reply to the question, agreeably to the laws of nature, which was the first, the bird to lay the egg, or the egg to produce the bird: and instead of all the antisciptural theories attempting to explain the secrets of geology, is it not better to repose on the intelligence imparted by the inspired volume, and on the omnipotence of Him, who could, *with a word and in a moment*, create all those effects, which we may not suppose him so fettered by his own laws as to accomplish only in ages? If, however, these views should after all be erroneous, or if we should be met with the *Nec Deus intersit*, it is satisfactory to reflect (though the solution be

clumsy), that we have still something to fall back upon, in the explanations of *believing* geologists, rather than resign altogether our *Bibles*, our creed, and our hopes. (See p. 179, quest. 133.)

To abandon the plain meaning of Scripture, and to adapt the word of God to the idol of imperfect science, is the first step in Rationalism. The author professes himself friendly to plenary inspiration, with unimportant diversities. He desires and wishes, in matters of revelation, to stand in the old ways.

i

SKETCHES IN DIVINITY.

SKETCHES IN DIVINITY.

1. *St. Matthew's Gospel—Hebrew and Greek.*

Matthew wrote his Gospel first in Hebrew, i. e. in Syro-Chaldee. Eusebius assigns the year 41, or third of Caligula, as the date. It was written for the benefit of the lost sheep of the house of Israel; and contains some particulars for the especial use of the Hebrew nation, such as the genealogy, which goes no higher than Abraham, many references to the Mosaic law, and allusions to the then prevalent sentiments among the Jews. Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.* lib. v. cap. 8) writes: ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφῇ ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγέλιον (ed. Moguntiae, 1672): and he is supported by the Fathers almost unanimously.

The Greek Gospel of Matthew, however, is also considered to be original; having been penned for the use of the Gentiles, when their conversion began to prevail. To say this, is better than to call the Greek a translation, for many things were altered. The quotations are not from the Hebrew, but from the Septuagint, as the most familiar to the Gentiles; and Hebrew names are translated, e. g. Golgotha. Mark (xv. 23) writes ἐσμυρισμένον οἶνον, *wine mingled with myrrh*; Matthew has it, μετὰ χολῆς, &c. *mingled with gall*. Both fulfil Psalm lxix. 21; for Matthew in Syriac had written *μαρ, gall*, or any thing *bitter, amarus*, and Mark had mistaken it for *μυρ, myrrh*. Harris's *Dict. of Script. Nat. Hist.* art. MYRRH.

2. *Where was the Gospel first preached in Europe?*

In *Philippi** (Acts xvi. 12), where Lydia was baptised, and the jailor converted.

* Some say, — in Thessalonica; but, according to Hooker, things are preached when promulgated in any way; and Ecclesiastes is called "the Preacher" in the same sense. *Eccl. Pol.* vol. ii. pp. 43, 60.

3. *The books of the New Testament arranged in three classes, and placed in chronological order.*

CLASS I.—*Historical.*

- MATTHEW.** Hebrew, A.D. 41. Greek, A.D. (Jerusalem) 61.
LUKE. Corinth, A.D. 53, Owen. Alexandria, A.D. 61, Michaelis. Events classed, rather than chronologically arranged. Genealogy (for the use of the Gentiles) goes up to Adam: Matthew's comes down from Abraham, being for the Jews.
MARK. Rome, under direction of Peter, A.D. 60 to 63. In some respects abridged from Matthew's.
JOHN. Against the Gnostics. Ephesus, A.D. 69, or, according to Mill, A.D. 97.
ACTS. Written by Luke, see ch. i. 1, A.D. later than 63.

CLASS II.—*Epistles by Paul, and not Catholic.*

Epistle to	Where written.	Michaelis.	Lardner.
	Thessalonica	A.D. 51	A.D. 52
GALATIANS			
1 THESSALONIANS	Corinth	52	52
2 THESSALONIANS	Corinth	52	52
1 CORINTHIANS	Ephesus	57	53
2 CORINTHIANS*	Macedonia	58	57
1 TIMOTHY	Macedonia	58	56
ROMANS	Corinth	58	58
PHILEMON		62	62
COLOSSIANS	} Rome	62	61
EPHESIANS			
PHILIPPIANS			
HEBREWS		63	63
TITUS	Nicopolis		56
2 TIMOTHY	Rome	67	61

CLASS III.—*Catholic Epistles and the Revelation.*

Epistle of	Where written, Michaelis.	Where written, Lardner.
	Jerusalem A.D. 49	Rome A.D. 64
1 PETER	Jerusalem A.D. 49	Rome A.D. 64
JAMES	... 61	Judea 61
2 PETER	Nicopolis 67	Rome 64
JUDE	64 or 65
1 JOHN	} before 70 }	Ephesus 80
2 & 3 John		Ephesus between 80 & 90
REVELATION	Patmos 96	Ephesus or Patmos 95 or 96

* Some place *Galatians* here: see Art. 4. life of Paul; and Percy's *Key*.

4. *St. Paul's life, and his writings chronologically arranged.*

Paul was originally named Saul; of the tribe of Benjamin, a Pharisee, born at Tarsus in Cilicia. He was a Roman citizen, as Augustus had given the freedom of Rome to the men of Tarsus, on account of their adherence to his interests. He was born two years before our Saviour, supposing him to have lived sixty-eight years, as Chrysostom says he did (tom. vi. Hom. 30).

He was sent early to Jerusalem, where he studied the law at the feet of Gamaliel. He persecuted the Christians; and in A.D. 33 he held the clothes of those who stoned Stephen (Acts vii. 58, 59), as consenting to his death. In the subsequent persecution, Paul distressed the believers (Gal. i. 13, Acts xxvi. 11), persecuting and wasting the church beyond measure; entering into houses, haling men and women to prison (Acts viii. 3), and unto death (xxii. 4); and causing them to blaspheme (xxvi. 11). Being mad against them, he persecuted them to strange cities; and went on this errand into Syria, with authority from Caiaphas to bring the believers to Jerusalem. Thus breathing out threats and slaughter, he was suddenly arrested in his course near Damascus by a great light, at mid-day, from heaven, which struck him to the ground. A voice was heard, *Saul, why persecutest thou me?*—and on his answering, *Who art thou, Lord?* it replied, *I am Jesus: it is hard for thee to resist the reluctances of thy conscience, or kick against its pricks.* Paul asked, *Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?*—on which Jesus sent him to Damascus. Here he was three days without sight, when Ananias was sent by Christ speaking in a vision, to open his eyes—not figuratively, for “as scales” fell from them. He was now baptised, and filled with the Holy Ghost. From Damascus he retired to Arabia, then under king Aretas; but soon returned to Damascus, and there preached the Gospel. This exposed him to persecution from the Jews, from whose hands he escaped by being let down over the wall in a basket (Acts ix. 24-27), A.D. 37, three years after his arrival at Damascus. On his coming to Jerusalem to confer with Peter, he found the disciples afraid of him, and doubtful as to his sincere conversion (Gal. i. 18); fears and doubts dis-

pelled by Barnabas. Hence he departed to Cæsarea and Tarsus, in which place of his birth he remained from A.D. 37 to A.D. 43. Barnabas brought him from Tarsus to Antioch, where he remained a year (Acts xi. 20-26); and, A.D. 44, was deputed, with his fellow-labourer, to carry a contribution from the Christians at Antioch to their poor brethren at Jerusalem, during a famine. The church at Antioch was directed, by the Holy Ghost, to separate Paul and Barnabas for the ministry, that they might extend the word of truth. They went to Seleucia, and thence to Cyprus. At Paphos they were obstructed by a magician, or sorcerer, Bar-Jesus, who tried to hinder the proconsul, Sergius Paulus, from embracing the Christian faith. But Saul deprived this man of his sight for a season, which produced the conversion of the proconsul; and it is thought, that on this occasion Saul changed his name to Paul, after Paulus, the new convert. Paul went next to Perga in Pamphylia, and Antioch in Pisidia, where the Jews opposed his preaching; in consequence of which, with Barnabas, he turned to the Gentiles in Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. At Lystra they cured a cripple; and the idolators would have offered sacrifices to them as gods, but they desired the Lystrians to turn from these vanities to the living God. From Lystra they made a tour round the cities of Southern Asia to Antioch in Syria; but we know only generally, that from A.D. 45 to A.D. 50 the ministerial labours of St. Paul were continued. A dispute arising in the church respecting the necessity of retaining the legal ordinances, the matter was referred to a council at Jerusalem, to which Paul and Barnabas were deputed. Here it was decreed, that the converted Gentiles should not Judaize; only keeping themselves from idolatry, fornication, and eating strangled things or blood, Acts xv.

Peter, after this, lived with the Gentiles at Antioch; but afterwards deserted them, fearing those of the circumcision; for which Paul openly rebuked him (Gal. ii. 11-16), A.D. 51.

Paul and Barnabas proposed to visit the churches they had planted; but a violent difference arose respecting John, or Mark, whom Barnabas proposed as a companion; but Paul refused to take him, as he had left him in Pamphylia. This occasioned their separation, Barnabas sailing with Mark to Cyprus;

while Paul, with Silas, after making a circuit of Syria and Cilicia (Acts xv. 36), went on to Derbe and Lystra. Here they found Timothy, a youth religiously educated by a Jewish mother, though having a Gentile father; whom Paul caused to be circumcised, for fear of the Jews, and then carried in his company through Asia Minor.

At Troas, a man of Macedonia, in a vision, invited Paul to come over thither. The associates accordingly sailed for Europe, and arriving at Neapolis, came to Philippi, where, in a neighbouring *προσέυχη*, by a river-side, Paul baptised Lydia of Thyatira, who received them into her house. He likewise exorcised the spirit of divination from a damsel; on which account her masters, seeing their profits gone, had the missionaries cast into prison. But at midnight, they were delivered, during an earthquake, by an angel; and converted the keeper, whose whole household they baptised.

The magistrates, having beaten them (though Roman citizens) with rods, besought them to leave the city; and passing through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where Paul preached Jesus Christ three Sabbaths in the synagogue. A tumult being raised, the believing brethren conducted Paul and Silas to Berea, where they found many inquiring minds, who searched the Scriptures, to see if they accorded with the new doctrines; but the Jews of Thessalonica following them, compelled the two preachers to withdraw to Athens. Here they had the pride and learning of an inquisitive people to contend with; but Paul reasoned with them, at the Areopagus, on "the unknown God," to whom they had built an altar.

Timothy was now sent back to Thessalonica, to comfort the persecuted Christians. Paul proceeded to Corinth, where he abode with Aquila, and worked at his trade of tent-making; but baptised Stephanas, Crispus, and Gaius, 1 Cor. i. 14, 16, 17, Acts xviii. 5, 1 Thess. iii. 6, 9, A.D. 52. He was joined here by Silas and Timothy, and wrote his first and second Epistles to the Thessalonians. The Jews at Corinth brought Paul before Gallio, a Gentile judge, who thought it no business of his to decide upon questions of the Jewish law. Paul shaved his head at Cenchrea, the sea-port of Corinth, having a vow of Nazariteship; and

went by Ephesus and Cæsarea to Jerusalem, that he might be present at the feast of Pentecost. He returned to Ephesus by Antioch, Galatia, and Phrygia, and abode here three years, from A.D. 54 to A.D. 57, Acts xix. 1-8.

Paul is thought to have now written his Epistle to the Galatians, with his own hand (Gal. vi. 11), A.D. 56; but some place it earlier, and some date it from Rome. It was more than fourteen years after his conversion, Gal. ii. 1. He wrote from Ephesus his first Epistle to the Corinthians, chiding them on account of their divisions. At Ephesus stood the famous Temple of Diana; and as Paul's preaching injured the craft of those who lived by idolatry, an insurrection was raised by Demetrius, who made silver models of the temple; but the town-clerk appeased the tumult; and Paul returned into Macedonia, purposing to go as far as Rome. Titus joined him here, and reported the good effect his first Epistle to the Corinthians had produced, which induced him to indite the second, whereof Titus was the bearer. Paul travelled through Achaia into Corinth, where he remained a year and a half, and whence he wrote his Epistle to the Romans, promising to see them shortly, for the Gospel had reached Rome before Paul's arrival. This letter was probably carried by Phœbe, deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, near Corinth, whom Paul recommends to the Roman disciples.

He now retraced his steps into Macedonia, and, halting at Philippi, came to Troas. As he preached here, *on the first day of the week* (the Christian Sabbath being already a holy ordinance), Eutychus, overcome with sleep, fell from a third loft, and was taken up as dead; but the apostle restored him to life. Paul went on foot to Assos, and embarked at Mitylene. Hence he sailed by Chios, Samos, Trogyllium, and so reached Miletus, where the bishops and elders of Ephesus met him. He addressed them affectionately; and, bidding them farewell, sailed to Tyre, from whence he proceeded by Cæsarea to Jerusalem. At Cæsarea, Agabus, a prophet, took Paul's girdle, saying, as he bound himself, *Thus shall the Jews do at Jerusalem to the owner of this girdle*. But Paul would not be dissuaded from his purpose, saying he was ready to die for the sake of the Lord Jesus.

James told Paul that a prejudice had been excited against

him among the Jews, by reason of his intercourse with the Gentiles, and advised him to make a demonstration of Judaism, by joining some Jews in the temple who had a Nazarite vow, and defraying their expenses. This measure of expedience, however, failed to save him from the fury of some Asian Jews; but from their violence he was rescued by Lysias, the governor of the Roman garrison, who permitted him to address the people from the stairs leading from the temple to that fort or prætorium. He here related the circumstances of his conversion, and mission to preach to the Gentiles; but no sooner had he touched this grating chord, than the Jews cried out, *Away with him! away with him!* Lysias secured him in the garrison; and was binding in order to scourge him, when Paul remonstrated against his being punished unheard, as contrary to his right of Roman citizenship.

Being now unbound, and brought before the chief-priests, he defended himself, when the high-priest commanded some one to smite him on the mouth; but Paul pleaded again his privilege, adding, *God shall smite thee, thou whited wall*; for which words he apologised, as soon as he knew that the order came from the high-priest; but seeing that some were Pharisees and some Sadducees, it occurred to him to divide them, by declaring himself to be a Pharisee, and charged for the hope of the resurrection. This caused a dispute, in which Paul was hurried back by Lysias into the castle. Forty Jews now bound themselves not to eat till they had assassinated Paul; but warned of this vow by his nephew, he communicated it to Lysias, who sent him, under a strong guard, to Cæsarea, to be judged by Felix, the Roman governor. His accusers followed, with Tertullus, a hireling orator, who delivered a flourishing speech. But Paul, in his second reply, made Felix tremble, and postpone the decision till a more convenient season. Expecting that Paul would purchase his liberty, Felix confined him for two years, till Porcius Festus came into Felix' room. And this man, willing to ingratiate himself with the Jews, proposed that his trial should proceed; but Paul appealed unto Cæsar himself, and to Cæsar it was determined to send him. This was in the year 62, when Nero sat on the throne. But Herod Agrippa the Second (the son of

Agrippa the First, who had put James to death, and had himself died miserably A.D. 44), having been made king of Judæa by Claudius, came to Cæsarea, and desired to see Paul, by whose eloquence he was *almost persuaded* to be a Christian. Paul was sent by sea to Myra in Lycia, whence he re-embarked in another ship belonging to Alexandria and bound to Italy. Arriving late in the year at the Four Havens in Crete, the master refused to comply with the counsel of Paul,—which was, to winter there. He put out to sea, but was tossed in a tempest; and at length the vessel was wrecked in a creek in Melita, now Malta, Acts xxviii. Here he shook the viper into the fire, which had coiled itself round his arm; and wrought some miracles of healing. After three months, they came, by Syracuse and Rhegium, through the Straits of Messina, to Puteoli; and Paul thence proceeded by land, through Appii Forum and the Three Taverns (on the Via Appia), to Rome. Here he was suffered to dwell in a hired lodging, but chained to a soldier for security; and thus he remained for two years, preaching the kingdom of God, and the advent of the Messiah. To *this chain* he makes frequent allusion (Acts xxviii. 20), and thus fixes the date of his Epistles to the Ephesians, to Philemon, and 2d to Timothy,—Ephes. iii. 1, iv. 1, Philemon ver. 10, 13, 2 Tim. i. 16, ii. 9. In Rome he converted some persons even of Nero's court, Philip. i. iv. The Philippians despatched their bishop, Epaphroditus, with money for Paul's assistance; and by him, on his return, the Epistle to that church was sent.

Onesimus, a slave of Philemon, having run away from his master at Colosse, found out Paul in Rome, and was serviceable to him. After his conversion, St. Paul sent him back to his master, bearing the Epistle to Philemon, A.D. 62. By the same hand he despatched his Epistle to the Colossians, whom he only knew by the report of Epaphras, his fellow-prisoner. He was released from prison A.D. 63, and wrote his Epistle to the Hebrews, the genuineness of which was at first doubted. Some of the Fathers say that Paul passed through Italy into Spain, and afterwards into Macedonia, Greece, Asia, Crete,* and returned

* Bishop Burgess extends the mission to Britain: but his reasons are ingenious probabilities.

to Rome A.D. 65. From Macedonia, A.D. 64, he wrote his first Epistle to Timothy, and that to Titus. In this journey he left books, parchments, and a cloak (*pænula*, the mark of a Roman citizen), with Carpus, his host at Troas.

On his first appearance, or trial, at Rome, he was again imprisoned, and visited by Onesiphorus. Here he wrote the 2d Epistle to Timothy, which Chrysostom calls his last testament. It is said he provoked Nero by converting one of his concubines; but this is without authority. We know he suffered martyrdom at the Aquæ Salvæ, near the Ostian Gate, at Rome, and was buried where the church of S. Paolo fuori delle Mura now stands.

5. *The Articles of our Church :—when published in their present form, and under whose authority.*

Henry VIII. published Articles, retaining some of the popish doctrines. Edward VI. published, A.D. 1552, forty-two Articles, agreed to in Convocation. These were repealed by Mary. But Elizabeth published Thirty-nine Articles, drawn up by the Convocation A.D. 1562, which were revised, with some slight alterations, in 1571. See *Bennett*.

6. *“Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.” Explain the import of this petition.*

Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God ; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man : but every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, James i. 13, 14. Satan is also called *the tempter* (Matt. iv. 3, 1 Thess. iii. 5), that is, by permission of God, who, having created men, and distinguished them by reason, sets heaven before them as a crown, to be obtained through an exercise of their faith, and faculties aided, but not forced, by his Holy Spirit ; for he will never suffer us to be tempted (unless by our own remissness) above what we are able to bear, but with the temptation will make a way to escape, 1 Cor. x. 13. *His grace is sufficient for us,* 2 Cor. xii. 9. His strength is perfected in our weakness, and *he will not refuse his Holy Spirit unto them who ask him,* Luke xi. 13. Thus will he deliver us from evil, or from the evil one, ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, as it stands in the Jewish formularies.

When, therefore, it is said, *God did tempt Abraham*, this signifies, God TRIED him (Gen. xxii. 1); and he thus tries his servants to prove their faith—to exercise their graces of resistance or patience—and to strengthen them by such trials. Thus are examples of obedience furnished; and men, under Divine assistance, fight their way to the kingdom of heaven. “Lead us not into temptation,” then, signifies, Suffer us not to be placed in situations of overwhelming trial; but whatever thou seest fit, may thy Spirit ever be at hand to deliver us from the evil; and may we not *grieve the Holy Spirit of God*, Ephes. iv. 30.

7. Ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, κτλ. Matt. ii. 2. *Were there other notices of the expected appearance of a king at that time, and of a star's presaging similar events?*

The scene of prophecy respecting the Messiah was opened gradually; and Daniel had fixed the time of his appearance to 70 weeks (i. e. weeks of years), or 490 years, from the going forth of the commandment to rebuild Jerusalem, after the Babylonish captivity; while Zechariah had spoken of him, *Behold, thy King cometh*; Dan. ix. 25, Zech. ix. 9. The prophecies of Daniel, and the Old Testament generally, were circulated in the East by the captive Israelites; and the still earlier prophecy of Balaam (Num. xxiv. 17), *A star shall arise out of Jacob, and a sceptre out of Israel*, was there applied to the Messiah, and brought the oriental magi, under the guidance of the star, to Bethlehem, with their offerings to the *King* of the Jews.

Tacitus (*Hist.* v. p. 621) writes, “Pluribus persuasio inerat antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret oriens, profectique Judææ rerum potirentur.” And Suetonius, in *Vita Vespas.* cap. iv. “Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur.”

Many of the prophecies, borrowing the emblems of earthly power, spoke of the Messiah as a king, a ruler, a conqueror, who should extend his dominion over the earth; but ignorance and national pride led the Jews to mistake the metaphorical for literal language. They knew not of a lowly Saviour, whose

kingdom was spiritual, and not of this world; but expected a mighty temporal deliverer. Their traditions and glosses excited the jealousy of Herod, and brought about the massacre of Bethlehem. Many false Messiahs arose before or about the time of our Saviour, relying on the same views; and Josephus tells us, that "the Jews rebelled against the Romans, encouraged by a *doubtful* prophecy, that about that time a great person should be born amongst them, who should rule the world."

Of the general expectation of the Messiah at the time of Christ's birth, we have proofs in John i. 45-49, xi. 27, Matt. xxvi. 63, John iv. 23, 29.

Virgil, in his fourth eclogue, supposed to be taken from the Sibylline books, speaks of a renovation of things as about to take place, and almost in the words of Scripture :

"Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo,
Aspice venturo lætentur ut omnia sæclo."

The Roman historians and poets speak of new stars as announcing the birth of extraordinary characters :

"Micat inter omnes
Julium sidus, velut inter ignes
Luna minores."
HOR.

8. *Does the Gospel of St. Matthew furnish any internal evidence that it was written for Jews?*

St. Matthew's Gospel has more references than the others to Jewish customs. He traces the genealogy of Jesus through David to Abraham, and there stops. In his publication of the *sermon on the mount*, our Lord is represented as correcting the popular expectations of a temporal kingdom; while he humbles pharisaical pride, and draws back the Jewish notions of the divine law from literal to spiritual obedience, and from ceremonious observances to purity of heart. He abounds in references to the prophetic writings of the Jews—prepares them for the admission of the Gentiles into the Christian Church—shews them that their privileges will condemn them,—and tells them that Christ is come, not to destroy, but to fulfil the law and the prophets.

9. *Jesus occurs as the name of several persons. Is there any thing in the New Testament that distinguishes Christ from such ?*

Jesus, or Joshua, was a common name among the Jews, as a benefactor was called *Soter* among the Greeks ; but our Saviour is distinguished as Christ—the anointed—the same as Messiah, מָשִׁיחַ Matt. i. 16, John xvii. 3. Again ; Jesus said, *There shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders ; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before,* Matt. xxiv. 25. Thus, our Lord's prophecy of his first coming to the destruction of Jerusalem, to be fulfilled in that generation, made a distinction between him and these false prophets. Many such are mentioned, and two in particular in Acts v., viz. Theudas, and Judas of Galilee, whose adherents were either destroyed or dispersed, and whose artifices came to nought. But the *stability* of the true Messiah's kingdom would be the chief distinction between him and the false Christs. Refrain, said Gamaliel, to the Sanhedrim, from injuring the apostles of Jesus ; *for if this counsel, or this work, be of men, it will come to nought ; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it,* Acts v. 38, 39.

10. *Of Christ's miracles, one only is related by all the evangelists, and several by St. Luke alone.*

The feeding of the five thousand is the *only miracle* related by all the evangelists. St. Luke alone relates the miracles of Zechariah's dumbness, the raising of the widow's son at Nain, the healing of the woman bowed together, the dropsical man, and the ten lepers.

11. *The civil and the sacred year.*

The *civil* year among the Jews commenced on the 15th of September, or their month Tisri, because it was an old tradition that the world was then created ; and it is reasonable to suppose, that when man was called into existence, the fruits of the earth would be ripe for his nourishment. This was also the time when, for the same reason, the waters abated after the deluge. From

this time the Jews computed their jubilees, dated contracts, and took note of the birth of children and the reign of kings.

Their *ecclesiastical* year began in March, on the first day of the month Nisan, in order to commemorate the release of their ancestors from Egyptian bondage. *Observe the month Abib, and keep the passover unto the Lord*, Deut. xvi. 1. Abib signifies *green ears of corn*; for part of the paschal solemnity was the waving of a sheaf of the first-fruits of the barley, then green and unripe, before the Lord. *This month shall be to you the first month of the year*, Exod. xii. 2; this day came ye out in the month Abib. From this month were computed the Jewish festivals and religious ordinances.

12. *Faith and belief, divine and human.*

Belief is assent, on testimony or other evidence, to a proposition which we do not know of ourselves.

Faith is belief in the truths of religion, and, if sincere, will lead to conduct in conformity with its conviction. It substantiates the invisible, and makes the future present; it is the *substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen*. It is in the heart, as well as in the understanding.

Human faith is reliance on human authority, or it relates to human affairs; and would make a man, in prudence, act in human affairs conformably to the strength of his belief in the truths proposed to him.

Divine faith is belief on the authority of God, and of those inspired Scriptures which are the voice of God. The objects of divine faith are matters of revelation. *Without divine faith it is impossible to please God: we must believe that he is, and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him*. And the genuineness of such a faith is tested by our actual diligent seeking of him; otherwise it is only a faith *in words*. Saving faith—that faith by which the Scripture saith *the just shall live* (Heb. x. 38)—is a belief in the merits of Christ as the sole ground of our salvation. But this faith must work by love; it must bear the fruits of repentance and holiness; otherwise, as in the former case, we but deceive ourselves in calling it faith at

all; *the devils believe, and tremble.* Gal. iii. 26, Eph. iii. 17, Gal. v. 6, James ii. 17, 19.

13. *Our daily bread, τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον.*

Bread here signifies *food*, as in Psalm cv. 16, or Matt. xv. 2, 26, Luke xiv. 1, 15, xv. 17; or *sustenance* in general, as in Prov. xxx. 8, including all things necessary for our spiritual as well as our temporal welfare, as Christ is called *the bread of life*, John vi. 48; *this is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die*, vi. 50. Ἐπιούσιον is compounded of ἐπί, *for*, and οὐσία, *substance, condition*; so that τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον signifies "all things needful for the support of body and soul." See Burton and Bloomfield on Matt. vi. 10.

14. *What is authenticity? The authenticity of the Gospels.*

A book is said to be *authentic* when it relates matters of fact; and its authenticity may be determined by external or internal evidence. The *external* evidence embraces the following questions, viz. Had the author an opportunity of knowing the facts recorded? or did he gather his information from those who had? Did he live at or near the *time*, and in or near the place where the facts are said to have occurred? Had the writer any inducement to falsify, or to give a colour to his narrative? If his statements have been questioned, by whom, at what time, and on what grounds?

Internal evidences of authenticity consist in the moral character of the writers, and in the language of their narrative, as suitable to the age and circumstances in which they wrote.

Now, of the *four Gospels*, two are written by eye-witnesses of the facts, and the others under the direction of eye-witnesses, all within forty years of the events related. These Gospels were publicly and frequently read, from the earliest times, in every Christian church; and all Christian churches, in every age and nation, have concurred in acknowledging these books to be the true records of the Christian religion. Thousands of martyrs

have sealed their belief in them with their blood. Neither early infidels, pagans, nor Jews denied, but all explicitly allowed, the genuineness of the books ; and genuineness contributes to prove authenticity.

The facts were addressed to the senses of men who could not be mistaken ; numerous, but no one was ever detected as false ; important, and must have engaged friends and enemies in a strict investigation of their truth. The evangelists had no conceivable motive to misrepresent, but every inducement of self-interest, and love of life and safety, to suppress these facts. If infidels have, in later times, called the facts in question, it is through loving darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil—perhaps from the pride of opposition, or the ignorance of imperfect investigation.

The books of the evangelists have all internal marks of authenticity. They refer or allude to miscellaneous facts, to the laws and customs of the places and times of which they wrote ; all in strict conformity with the accounts of other, and these unbiassed or hostile, writers : they contain no inconsistent passages ; and are supported by contemporary historians. The Gospels are cited by the early Fathers, and have never been forgotten or altered in eighteen centuries : indeed, the jealousy of contending sects has preserved them pure from interpolation or alteration. They are written in Hellenistic Greek, just as Jews in the condition of the reputed authors *would* write, their style being mixed with Hebraisms, Syriacisms, and plainnesses. They bear no marks of exaggeration, party-spirit, or sinister design ; but are the artless production of men candidly confessing their own faults, who courageously suffered every extremity, without retraction, or even a prudent silence. The narrative, if false, might have been disproved at the time of its appearance. The wonderful change it immediately wrought in the world winds up the proof of its authenticity.

All this argument in favour of the authenticity of the Gospels is independent of the inspiration under which we might maintain the evangelists wrote.

15. *The chief among the publicans, Luke xix. 2.*

The ἀρχιτελώνης was the receiver-general of taxes in a district where several inferior officers were employed. From the dislike of the Jews to publicans, and the connexion of *heathen* and *publican* (Matt. xviii. 17) in Scripture, it is likely that the chief publican was *usually* a Gentile; yet it is certain that Zaccheus was a Jew, as in Luke xix. 9 he is called *a son of Abraham*.

The ἀρχιτελώναι were men of great consideration in the Roman government; and among them, according to Cicero, was the flower of the Roman knighthood: "Flos enim equitum Romanorum Publicanorum ordine continetur."—*Pro Cn. Planc.* cap. ix.

16. *Origin of evil.*

Natural evil is whatever disturbs the happiness of natural beings, according to the order of things, or the will of Providence. *Moral* evil is the innate corruption of the heart, and the sins into which it leads mankind. Both natural and moral evil result from the sin of Adam, who, by disobedience, tainted the root, and infected all the branches with sinfulness and sorrow. But the origin of both natural and moral evil is reconcilable to the goodness of God. God, having endowed men with reason and free agency, intended to exercise these faculties, in order to increase their happiness. Now, this exercise supposes an option to be set before them between good and evil; and even when Adam embraced the latter, the *goodness* of God was displayed in the provision of a remedy,—*the promised seed of the woman, who should bruise the serpent's head*. When we consider ourselves as probationers for eternity (and it is His goodness who made us such); when we remember that we are free and rational agents (another gift of His goodness),—it is an unavoidable consequence, that a promise of good and a threat of evil *should* be set before us. For our offences, on repentance, atonement is prepared; while, as a corrective of the evil bias of our nature, spiritual influence is provided: and the goodness of God sets heaven before us,—an unlimited felicity in return for a limited and imperfect obedience.

Some evils of life are unavoidable, though many are the avoidable results of sin or imprudence; and even the unavoidable evils of life become the means of good. Uninterrupted prosperity corrupts the mind, and makes men forgetful of their being here in a state of trial. But evil produces soberness, seriousness, consideration, self-acquaintance, repentance, resolution, prayer, hope; and all these are the elements of eternal happiness. We weigh the vanities of earth against the purities of heaven; the shortness and uncertainty of life against the duration and security of eternity. If evils produce such effects as these, surely it is a Divine goodness which sends them; and we shall own this when they land us in heaven. *Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth. It is good for me that I have been afflicted; for thereby have I known thy law. Our light afflictions, which are but for a moment, work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.*

Now, God had power to prevent both natural and moral evil; but not in consistence with that freedom and rationality with which he had distinguished man. Without an option between good and evil, these faculties would have withered: every idea of heaven as a recompense, every idea of obedience as voluntary, would have been taken away; and by the absence of these the Divine glory would have been dimmed.

17. Proof of Christianity from the low estate of its first professors.

The low estate of the first professors of Christianity proves its divine origin, first, as being the fulfilment of a prophecy (namely, that of Isaiah), in connecting the evidence of miracles with that of the internal benevolence of the system; *the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them*, Isa. lxi. 1, Matt. ii. 5. The poor were neglected by all heathen religions, previous to the appearance of Christianity; while the Pharisees kept the key of knowledge from them among the Jews. Every where false policy, to keep them in subjection, kept them in ignorance of their spiritual welfare. Had the Gospel made its first proselytes among the rich and powerful, its rapid and astonishing progress would have been ascribed by infidelity to the influence of wealth,

authority, power, learning, example; and not to the Spirit of God, acting by persuasion, and employing humble, poor, illiterate, uninfluential, and (in the common course of things) inadequate agents. *But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us,* 2 Cor. iv. 7.

Again, all men are sinners, and the souls of all are of equal value before God. Riches are but an earthly distinction: intellectual capacity, reason, conscience, are the same in the poor as in the rich. A religion, then, which should overlook the poor, would prove its falsehood by its partiality: a religion which regards them, shews its truth. *Not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; that no flesh should glory in his presence,* 1 Cor. i. 27, 29.

The first preachers of the Gospel did not rest their cause on the issue of laboured arguments, but on plain facts of which they were witnesses, and extraordinary works which they performed. Men of low rank and ordinary education were sufficient to judge of these; and it was not till a later period, when philosophers were to be reasoned with, and men of this world induced to submit to the self-denying Gospel, that St. Paul, an educated reasoner, was called; and by *his* powers, under God, Sergius Paulus, and Dionysius the Areopagite, men of consideration, were converted. But the truth required not men of consideration at first; it could stand by itself: it wanted only honest witnesses to a fact.

Impostors would open their scheme by flattering the rich and powerful; not by declaiming against their vices—not by telling them they must sell all they had, to follow their new Master—not by telling them *it was easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter heaven.* By courting the rich, they might expect support, patronage, protection, authority: by turning to the poor, they knew they would provoke the powerful to persecute and crush them; yet they *did* so provoke them, and such was the consequence. But under these disadvantages the new religion flourished and extended itself. By what power but that of God?

The poor were not the first called as being the more simple and credulous, but as having better dispositions towards the Gospel than the great. None, however, were refused; and both Nicodemus and Zaccheus, wealthy Israelites, were among the earliest converts. But in general, the rich Jews were, on the one hand, too bloated with the things of this world; and, on the other, too full of prejudice, and expectations of temporal dominion, to stoop to the humility of the Gospel. They persecuted the believers; and their own conversion was circuitously effected by witnessing the courage and patience with which their inflictions were borne. When such effects multiplied upon them, they became convinced that the religion which produced them required calm examination, and could be no deception.

Christianity, by addressing itself to the poor and unprotected, had the greater obstacles to encounter; and its progress itself became miraculous, evincing the immediate protection of God.

Had learning and eloquence in the teachers acted upon wealth and power in the hearers, infidelity would have called the Gospel a political engine—a league of cunning orators covetous of money and influence, with cunning rulers covetous of power; and its progress, the natural consequence of this juggling combination. As it is, we affirm that God's Holy Spirit carried through a religion against all human probability; and this itself was a miracle.*

18. *The sibyls.*

The sibyls were women said to be inspired by Heaven, who flourished in different parts of the world. They are believed to have been ten in number, the chief of whom dwelt at Cumæ, near Naples, and had lived 700 years, old and distressed, when Æneas came into Italy; having obtained of Apollo leave to live

* If the proof drawn from the low estate of the first professors relate to the apostles, the grandeur and comprehensiveness of the system was naturally beyond their reach, as prejudiced and unlettered Jews. Again, such men could not have carried on a false system for any length of time, without detection; nor were they likely to fabricate a story which should bring them distress, persecution, death.

as many years as there were grains of sand in her hand when she made the request. This sibyl wrote her prophecies on leaves, which, being left at the mouth of her cave, were dispersed by the winds, and thus became incomprehensible. It was this sibyl who came to Tarquin the Second, demanding an exorbitant price for nine volumes of prophecies. On being refused, she returned, first, with six, and then with three, demanding the same sum as at first. The books were at length bought, and entrusted to a college of priests, who consulted them on great occasions. They were burned with the capitol, in the time of Sylla, and messengers were sent into Greece to collect the sibylline verses of all the other sibyls. The fate of these verses is unknown; but it is believed that from some of them Virgil took his fourth Eclogue. The more modern sibylline books were forgeries of the second century; yet this prophecy of a new order of things, speaking distinctly of the Messiah, must have preceded his appearance. It was probably taken from the Septuagint, which circulated the prophets in Greek 200 years before our Saviour. The apostle tells us (Rom. iii. 2), that the oracles of God were committed to the Jews; but no sacred writer mentions the sibylline prophecies.

19. Διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, 1 Cor. xi. 10. *Explain.*

All the ancient commentators are agreed in translating *ἐξουσία* a *covering*, or *veil*, a symbol of being under the authority of the man; as Theophylact explains it, τὸ τοῦ ἐξουσιάζεσθαι σύμβολον, τουτέστι τὸ κάλυμμα. Wherefore Whitby's paraphrase, "because of the evil angels;" and the reason given by others, viz. the woman having been tempted by the devil to do that which has been the cause of her shame and subjection,—cannot be admitted. Modesty was her peculiar feature; and her subjection to the man, as the first created, was appointed before she was tempted by the devil. Some call the angels here mentioned Jewish witnesses, or heathen spies, who would censure any impropriety in the church. Owen and Archbishop Newcome pronounce the words a marginal gloss; but this notion is contrary to all the MSS. The true meaning is, "in reverence for the angels;" alluding to those ministering spirits whom the Jews and early

Christians believed to be peculiarly present in places of worship. See Hammond, and Bloomfield's Synopsis in loc. Ps. cxxxviii. 1, Sept. *ἐναντίον ἀγγέλων ψαλῷ σοι*, and v. 2. Philo reckons among the auditors of the hymns sung at the Temple, *τοὺς ἀγγέλους λειτουργοὺς ἐφοροὺς κατὰ τὴν σοφῶν ἐμπειρίαν θεοσμένους, μὴ τι τῆς φθῆς ἐκμελές*, i. e. *inharmonious*; for these spirits, characterised by purity, humility, and subordination, would be grieved at any violation of congruity in the lower family of God; 1 Tim. v. 21, Heb. i. 14, Eph. iii. 15.

In the most ancient Liturgies, and the Constit. Apost. viii. 4, angels are supposed to be present at divine worship, especially upon solemn occasions; either as joining in the services, or being witnesses to what takes place: and we read also in Origen, *contra Celsum*, lib. v. p. 233, that they may convey the prayers of the just to the throne of God.

This view of *δὲ τοὺς ἀγγέλους* may further be extended to signify—in imitation of the angels, who veil their heads with their wings before the throne of God, as they did before the mercy-seat; Isa. vi. 2, *Above the throne stood the seraphims, each one had six wings: with twain he covered his face, &c.*

20. *Creation, its various meanings.*

Creation is the calling of any thing into existence. It is of two kinds, natural and spiritual. 1st, Natural; as, *In the beginning, [when] God created the heavens and the earth*; or as when a child is born. 2d, Spiritual; as when the natural man is, by the washing of regeneration, born again, and, as the Scripture says, *the new man put on, created after God in righteousness and true holiness*, Eph. iv. 24. Thus David says, *Create in me a new heart*, Ps. li. 10. *For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works*, Eph. ii. 10.

21. *Plurality of persons in one Godhead, by whom believed.*

The idea of a plurality of persons in one Godhead obtained among the Persians, Egyptians, and Hindoos. The Persian Zoroaster says, "The paternal monad, or unity, generates a duality; and a triad of Deity, of which a monad is the head,

shines forth throughout the world." The triad is called in the fragments of his oracles, virtue, and wisdom, and truth : these oracles were written in Chaldaic, and translated afterwards into Greek. Oromasdes, Mithra, and Ahiram (Mithra being the mediator), are the Persian vestiges of a trinity. Brahma, Vishnu, and Sceva, are the Hindoo triad ; and the grand Hindoo deity is represented, in the cavern of Elephantina, near Bombay, as a figure with three heads and one body — the creator, preserver, and regenerator. The trinity of Egypt was exhibited in Osiris, Cneph, and Ptha ; and symbolized by a globe, a serpent, and a wing, on the temples and obelisks ; the globe being deity, or the father ; the serpent, wisdom or λόγος ; and the wing, spirit. All these mythologies were vestiges of the patriarchal religion ; and hence too the Platonists derived their ἀγαθόν, νοῦς, ψυχή. As the doctrine of the Trinity can be discovered in the Old Testament, so was it admitted by learned Jews in their Targums. The shechinah, the word, the angel of God, is considered as Divine by the Jewish writers.

22. *Episcopacy.*

Bishops are a higher *order* of office-bearers in the Church, each invested with authority over a district, and whose chief business is to ordain, and send forth ministers by the imposition of hands. Episcopacy is of Divine authority, inasmuch as the constitution of the Church of Christ (who came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil or perfect it) was formed on the model of the polity of the Hebrews, who, besides the God, the head, of their theocracy, had high-priests, priests, and Levites. The twelve apostles had reference to the heads of the twelve tribes, as the seventy had to the Sanhedrim. Christ, our great High-Priest, assumed not his office without authority from his Father ; *Every high-priest, taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining unto God. And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high-priest ; but he that said unto him, This day have I begotten thee, Heb. v. 1, 4, 5. Christ, the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls,* made a distinction between the two classes of ministers whom he

sent forth to establish his kingdom—the twelve apostles, and the seventy. To the apostles he said, *As my Father hath sent me, even so SEND I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost : whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c.* John xx. 21-23. Accordingly, the apostles were invested with, and claimed authority over the persons whom *they*, in their turn, appointed to sacred offices ; and the elders of Ephesus were summoned to Miletus by Paul, to receive from him instructions ; among which we find the words, *Take heed unto all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you OVERSEERS.* The apostles likewise conveyed to others, as their successors, the privilege of authority over priests, 1 Tim. v. 1. While the apostles lived, the word *elder*, or *presbyter*, was applied indiscriminately to the *priests* and the *overseers* of the priests, i. e. the bishops ; but when these personal friends of our Lord were removed from the earth, the word *apostle* was laid aside, and that of *bishop* exclusively used, in contradiction to that of *presbyter*, as signifying the highest rank of ecclesiastical functionaries. The distinction of office, however, was always in the Church ; and we challenge the enemies of episcopacy to point out a time later than that of the apostles when it began. Bishops were termed apostles by St. Paul, and angels of churches by St. John. The apostles who were presbyters when the great ἐπίσκοπος, or overseer, was on earth, became bishops from the time of his breathing on them, and more especially from that of the descent of the Holy Ghost at the first Christian pentecost. Prior to this time, the apostles—still called the twelve—had no power of governing the Church. Neither they, nor the seventy, could ordain ; for they were told to supply the want of labourers in the harvest, not by appointing others, but by praying the Lord of the harvest, that HE would send forth labourers into his harvest, Luke x. 1-17. This is the principle of episcopacy, and was in the Church from the beginning. The fact of being ordained to the ministry did not, and does not, confer the power of ordaining others ; to this, episcopal consecration is necessary. After having received the Holy Ghost—but not until then, not until the great Bishop of souls had left the earth,—the apostles

began to ordain both presbyters and deacons; and, as their first act, they installed Matthias in the place of Judas, who, if already among the seventy, as he was according to Clemens Alexandrinus, was thus advanced in *degree*. Such is our argument with the Presbyterians. Against the Independents we affirm, that episcopacy vests in the individual bishop an authority of inspection over the churches and presbyters of a district. John exercised authority over the seven churches of Asia, Rev. i. 4. Paul, called to be an apostle, was a bishop, having the care of *all* the churches, 2 Cor. xi. 28; he appointed Titus to be bishop of Crete, and Timothy of Ephesus. Titus was sent to Crete (where there were already presbyters) to ordain other elders in every city, and to rebuke heretics, Tit. i. 5; as was Timothy to Ephesus, to exercise authority over presbyters or elders, to lay hands (or ordain), though *suddenly on no man* (1 Tim. v. 1, 22); and to commit the things he had heard to faithful men, that *they* might be able to teach others also. All the ancient Fathers call Timothy the first Bishop of Ephesus; and a list of his successors—in all twenty-seven—until the Council of Chalcedon, remains.

Philip the *Deacon*, who was *an ecclesiastic*, ordained by imposition of hands, baptized the Samaritans; but Peter and John were sent to Samaria to perform an office beyond the power of deacons—an inferior order, who were servers of tables and distributors of alms. It has now been shewn that there were three orders of the Church from its beginning: 1, Christ; 2, the twelve; 3, the seventy; or, after the death of Christ, bishops, priests, and deacons: and that episcopacy, as including the power of ordination, and the authority of one over a district, has subsisted ever since there were ministers to ordain, or districts to superintend. It was, therefore, a Divine institution.

23. *The moral sense.*

The moral sense is an instinctive perception of right and wrong—antecedent to reasoning, and to any positive law or feeling of obligation; or, according to some, a process of reasoning so swift as to be imperceptible. As the eyes wink instinctively on the approach of physical danger, may not this be an

involuntary mental nictation on the approach of moral danger? Is not this exemplified in the modest blush of women, and in courage among men? Some philosophers deny such a perception, on Mr. Locke's principle of our having no innate ideas; but it seems to be given us by Providence for safety and prompt decision in emergencies which admit not of reflection. Why should God preserve the lower animals by instincts from physical evil, and neglect provision for the suddenly endangered *spiritual* welfare of his highest work? Does not analogy require this provision? The mind may possess an instinctive approbation or disapprobation of certain objects, without innate ideas of the sounds, colours, flavours, which so affect them. Moral instincts are proofs of a moral government, and earnest of its future development: education, or circumstances, improve or deteriorate them. See Dugald Stewart on the Mind, p. 238; Conybeare's Inaugural Address; Butler's Analogy; Hutchinson on Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric, p. 63.

24. *To belief in Christianity, is comprehension of all its doctrines necessary?*

It is often said, that "where *mystery* begins, religion ends." But this will not answer the purpose even of a deist; for nothing can be so mysterious as the existence of a God, and yet to believe in this is the foundation of all religion. To say that nothing is to be believed which cannot be fully understood and comprehended, is a false proposition; for how many things in the course of nature do we not merely believe, but know, of the principles of which we are ignorant?—as the vegetation of plants—the generation and growth of animals—the properties of the magnet—the union of soul and body—the action of mind on matter.

When reason has once discovered Christianity to be a religion from heaven, and the Scriptures to be true, it must admit what God declares, although incomprehensible—since God must know the truths revealed in his word better than his creatures can know them. For us to question the proceedings of God is presumption.

The moles and bats, in full assembly, find,
On special search, the keen-ey'd eagle blind.

See the fine passage in Bishop Watson's Apology for the Bible. Can we explain the eternity of duration and the immensity of space? Yet we know these things to be certainties. Here the arguments against Christianity press equally hard on deism; and we must be either Christians or atheists on this principle. "I have dissected many bodies," said a sneering anatomist; "but I never saw the soul." "Then you disbelieve its existence?" "Of course." "You are, then, an atheist." "No; not an atheist." "Did you ever see God?"

25. *Paul was peculiarly qualified for the office of apostle to the Gentiles.*

The Jews sought after a sign; and the other apostles, though unlearned, could convince them as WITNESSES, by their perseverance unto death, that signs *had* been wrought; they could also themselves work signs, i. e. miracles. The Greeks demanded WISDOM; and Paul was wise, learned, eloquent—versed in their philosophy—quoting their poets—a master of argument. The other apostles might have mingled Judaism with the Christianity they taught; but Paul saw the spiritual meaning of Judaism. Paul could convert the very ignorance of the most refined Gentiles into an admission of the necessity for revelation—a use he made of the altar to the unknown God at Athens. Paul was capable of coping with the early heretics. The outcry of "prejudiced, ignorant fanatic," could not silence Paul. Neither the procrastination of Felix, nor the apathy of Agrippa, nor the prophecy of Agabus, could shake his purpose, or scare him from his course. He had no prejudice in favour of the Mosaic law, except as a system of prophecy and type fulfilled by the accomplishment, and of shadows absorbed in the substance. He knew that justification by faith superseded the *ceremonial works* of the law, and implied a regard to its moral precepts. His enlarged mind knew the limits of expedience, while, at first, the Jewish abhorrence of blood and of idol-sacrifices prevented amalgamation and *eating* with the Gentiles; and less guilty prejudices were to be *gradually* removed: yet no expedience silenced him, or prevented the sacrifice of himself in the cause of truth. He could circumcise Timothy, to

gain access for him among the Jews, and yet consistently teach that circumcision was unnecessary. In this respect, he could reprove Peter for a cowardly compromise on the subject. He was a Roman citizen, and could appeal against all unjust persecution to a higher tribunal. By his education and mental powers, he could vary his reasoning in making converts, and was *all things to all men*. He made his way even into the palace, and gained some of the emperor's household. By zeal, intrepidity, learning, and courteous manners, he was well qualified for the office of a missionary; and he persevered, amid all difficulties, to the end.

26. *On mysteries in religion.*

See Art. 24. A mystery has two senses: first, It is a truth revealed by God, which is not discoverable by our natural reason; and, secondly, It is a truth which remains incomprehensible even after it has been revealed. There are mysteries in matters of faith, in order to fill our minds with reverential awe, to humble our pride and self-sufficiency, and to engage us in a diligent search into the hidden things of God. Lastly, mysteries furnish doubting minds with an evidence of a future state of being, in which our faculties shall be enlarged, and we shall no longer see through a *glass darkly*, or as in a *clouded (metal) mirror*, and as it were in an *enigma*, δι' ὁμίαντων ἐν αἰνύματι (1 Cor. xiii.), but *face to face*; for it is not to be supposed that God would give his reasonable creatures an obscure knowledge, imperfect hints, notions of things not yet revealed — without the intention of revealing them: He would have left them in contented ignorance if he had intended no farther information: He would not have made the human mind a vessel of large dimensions, to pour into it a scantling of contents. Since our capacity of knowledge is boundless, then, mysteries are a prophecy of immortality. Mysteries in religion are, on proper authority, to be believed; because, if we do not believe them, we can believe hardly any thing. If the works of nature, the growth of plants, the instinct of animals, the union of body and soul, the nature of spirit, are all pregnant with mysteries — how can it be supposed, that what relates to the Divine Being himself, who was, and is, and is to

come—the Maker, Preserver, and Ruler of all—his personality combined with his omnipresence—his union with Jesus—his permission of evil, and control over it—his general and particular Providence,—that these shall be without mystery?

We are to believe mysteries, then, not by attempting to solve them, but on the authority of Him who reveals them; and we prove the mysterious doctrine itself, by proving the testimony of Him who reveals it to be infallible. We are not to reject a doctrine, on the ground of *our* reason's being wiser than that of God. We may be certain, that if God has revealed a doctrine, but not revealed the manner of understanding it, our understanding of that doctrine is not necessary to our acceptance with God. Our *belief* in it is necessary, because God has revealed it: our *understanding* of it is not necessary, because God has not given the power, or revealed the way of understanding it.

Let us apply to mysteries the following texts: *God is a God that hideth himself*, Job xxiii. 9; *We cannot, by searching, find out God*, xi. 9. *Such knowledge is too wonderful and excellent for us: we cannot attain unto it*, Ps. cxxxix. 6. *If I tell you of earthly things, and you understand them not, how shall ye understand if I tell you of heavenly things*, John iv. 21. *No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him* (John i. 18), i. e. hath declared God's attributes and designs—a mystery, in the first sense mentioned above, to be believed; but hath not given us fully to understand them, a mystery in the second sense. Our salvation, then, depends on the belief, but not on the full understanding, of these mysteries.

27. On transubstantiation.

When our Saviour instituted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, his words were, *This do in remembrance of me*, Luke xxii. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 24. It was a commemorative rite—as was the passover, its type. Now, remembrance is calling to mind an event *past*, and is essential to the nature of that sacrament; but transubstantiation makes the event *present*, and is thus opposed to the nature of a sacrament. The phrase, *This is my body*, is to be understood (like *This is the love of God*, *This is*

eternal life, This is the law and the prophets), as “*This signifies my body;*” and as to the phrase, *Crucify the Son of God afresh* (Heb. vi. 6), it is plainly figurative, and equivalent to *putting him to open shame*. Christ *once* suffered (1 Peter iii. 18), once in the end of the world: he was offered in his own blood, not like the high-priest offering *every year* a sacrifice, Heb. ix. 25, 26, Rom. vi. 10. He died unto sin *once*, *ἐφάπαξ*—once for all, Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12, x. 10.

As nothing can be a sign of itself, it is equally a solecism to call a present event a remembrance of itself.

28. *The Trinity.*

John i. 1, Καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. The Christian church considers the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to be three persons, but one in substance, power, and eternity; the Father neither created nor begotten; the Son not created, but eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost neither created nor begotten, but eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son (Nicene and Athanasian creeds): it considers Christ as God, of the substance of the Father, because he is the λόγος, John i. 1.

SYLLOGISM I. *By the Word (or λόγος) all things were made*, John i. 3. *By Christ all things were made*, 2 Peter iii. 5, Ephes. iii. 9, Coloss. i. 16. Therefore Christ is the Word.

SYLLOGISM II. *The Word is God*, John i. 1. *Christ is the Word*, Rev. xix. 30. Therefore Christ is God.

That Christ is of one substance with the Father, follows of course—not *ὁμοιούσιος*, as the semi-Arians maintained at the Council of Nice, but *ὁμοούσιος*, having one *will* with the Father, as God: *I and my Father are one*, John x. 30.

Socinus said, “The Word was the mandate of the Father;” but Dr. Hey asks, Could the mandate be the Father, or be *with* the Father before mandates were made; or could the mandate make all things? Hey, *Divinity Lectures*, vol. ii. pp. 110, 329.

Here, in avoiding a division of the substance, we do not, like the Sabellians, confound the persons; for the offices of the

several persons keep them distinct—the first devising a plan, the second executing, and the third applying it. *He* (the Spirit) *shall glorify me; for He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you*, John xvi. 14: these are the words of that Son whom God sent into the world.

29. *Peculiarities of St. Luke's style.*

Matthew and Mark arrange the facts chronologically; Luke (like Livy, Suetonius, &c.), according to a *classification* of events; and here tenses are less regarded or material. Luke wrote the Acts (in the latter part of which he was personally concerned, *quorum pars magna fuit*) as a journal; and men write journals, sometimes in the present, and sometimes in the imperfect tense. Luke wrote his gospel under the dictation of Paul, and caught his master's manner. He was a man, too, of education, and may have adopted the enallage of change of tense to give his treatise a livelier interest. His rehearsal of the songs of Mary, Simeon, and Zacharias, shews an elegant mind; and the history of the transactions at Emmaus may be singled out as graphical. See Bishop Cleaver's sermon on St. Luke's style; and Adam Clarke's Commentary.

30. *The genealogy of Christ.*

It was necessary that a *virgin* should conceive, and bring forth a son, of the tribe of Judah and family of David,—who should be born at Bethlehem. Now, when Joseph was diverted, by the angel Gabriel, from his purpose of divorcing Mary, he repaired with her to Bethlehem, *his* own city, to be enrolled in the Roman census, as *he* was of the house and lineage of David; and, not prosecuting Mary according to Deuteronomy xxii. 23, 24, he was held to be the legal father of the child Jesus.

But as Gentiles, to whom Luke wrote, might ask, how was Christ of the family of David, if Joseph was not his real father, it was necessary to trace the genealogy of Mary, and to connect *her* too with the family of David.

It was not strictly necessary that the mother of the Messiah should be of the tribe of Judah, any more than it was necessary that every or any female of the ancestral line should be of that

tribe: we find, indeed, among these females, Rahab a Canaanitess, and Ruth a Moabitess; and the Jewish women of every tribe longed for a numerous offspring, as multiplying their chances for the honour of bringing forth the great Deliverer. Hence records were kept in every family of their domestic pedigree, in addition to the public records; but chiefly in the tribe of Judah.

Mary, as the cousin of Elisabeth, it is said, was of the tribe of Levi; but this tribe had been blended with that of Judah by the marriage of Aaron with Elisheba, sister of Naashon, prince of Judah, Exod. vi. 23, Num. i. 7. Jeremiah blends the two tribes as giving birth to the Messiah—Judah as king, Levi as priest, Jer. xxxiii. 17, 24, Mal. ii. 4.

Gabriel had told the virgin, that God should give her divine Son the throne of his father David. Mary is called by the Jews the daughter of Heli, בִּתְעֵלִי (see Lightfoot on Luke iii. 23), and by the early Christian historians, the daughter of Joachim; but Joachim and Eliakim, of which Eli is a contraction, are transposable (2 Chron. xxxvi. 4), both being names of God, יְהוָה and אֱלֹהִים. Matthan and Melchi, says Eusebius (lib. i. c. 8), married the same woman, so that Jacob in the line of Solomon, and Heli in that of Nathan, were half-brothers. Joseph came from David, by the line of Solomon (Matt. i. 6); Mary from David, by the line of Nathan, his other son (Luke iii. 31); and both lines met in Salathiel (Matt. i. 12, 13, Luke iii. 27), and again diverged in the sons of Zerubbabel. See Adam Clarke's Bible, Prolegom., and Barrett's Genealogy.

The Jews never inserted women in their public genealogies; but when a line ended with a female, the name of her husband was inserted, and he was called the *son* of her father, though really the son-in-law. Hence Joseph's genealogy was the public recorded and legal genealogy. Observe, Matthew, recording the natural pedigree in the descending line, says all along, "A begat B," &c.: Luke, ascending from Joseph, through Heli, according to the public line or legal genealogy, writes, "which was the son," &c.; and says of Jesus *ὡς ἐνομίζετο*, *as was reckoned by law*, "the son of Joseph."

The female established the descent in both branches, but Joseph was the legal representative. Son signifies, in both the cases of Salathiel and Joseph, *son-in-law*. Hale, vol. iii. p. 42.

31. *The birth-right and the blessing.*

A birth-right implied, 1st, A double portion of the father's effects, called בְּלִכְרֵךְ, or the *first-born*, that the head and representative of the family might support its honour, and assist the younger children; 2d, An authority over his brethren, as a judge for settling internal differences, and a leader in redressing external wrongs, Gen. xxvii. 29, xlix. 3, 4, 8 (Brown's *Antiq.* vol. ii. p. 285); 3d, Before the law, the first-born presided as priest at the family-sacrifices; 4th, He occupied the first place, Gen. xliii. 33; 5th, To the first-born was attached the honour of being the progenitor of the Messiah; and, 6th, The first-born were, all along, the types of Him who should be the *first-born among many brethren* (Parkhurst, Rom. viii. 29), and *should be the first-born from the dead*, Colos. i. 18, Acts xxvi. 22, 1 Cor. 15, 20, 23, Rev. i. 5.

All these privileges might be forfeited by gross misconduct, or sold for base advantage. Esau sold them for a mess of pottage. The parent might reserve the whole or part of his own *blessing* for which son soever he pleased. In Jacob's family, the first-born, Reuben, was set aside from the honour of giving birth to the Messiah, by reason of his invading his father's bed by concubinage with Bilhah (Gen. xxxv. 22, xlix. 40); as were the two next, Simeon and Levi, as instruments of treachery and cruelty to the Shechemites (Gen. xxxiv. 25, xlix. 5-7): and Judah, the fourth son, was selected as the next in order to be blessed as the progenitor of Shiloh, and the holder of the sceptre or rod of authority, Gen. xlix. 10. In the case of Esau, Isaac pronounced the blessing on Jacob by mistake, and could not recall it; for as to the birth-right in the family, Esau had to blame himself: consequently he hated Jacob, not on account of the birth-right, but of the *blessing* he had filched from their father, Gen. xxvii. 41. Yet he received a blessing; which his posterity have amply realised. Another instance of the blessing conveyed ignorantly and involuntarily—contrary to the right of primogeniture—was that of Jacob's setting his right hand on the head of Ephraim, instead of that of Manasseh, the first-born; which displeased Joseph, but could not be retracted, Gen. xlviii. 8-22, xli. 51, 52.

32. *Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire : mine ears hast thou opened.* Margin, “*digged* ;” אָזְנוֹיָם פִּרְיִית “*penetrated*,” Parkhurst. Psalm xl. 6. *Allusion to a Jewish custom.*

The whole purport of this verse, and of various other passages in the Old Testament, is to depreciate the sacrifices of the Levitical law as substitutes for moral obedience, or as having any value save as types of the *one sacrifice for the sins of the whole world*. The passage in question is quoted, with some slight variation, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. x. 5, *A body hast thou prepared me ;* κατηρίσω, *adjusted, adapted to me*. As to the custom alluded to, it is that of a master’s boring with an awl, to the door or door-post, the ear of a servant, who, on the seventh year of service, had the option of going out free, but of his own accord chose to remain, through pure love of his master (Exod. xxi. 2, Deut. xv. 16, 17, Jer. xxxiv. 14) ; so that this custom is consistent with Bishop Horne’s interpretation, “*God hath made me obedient*”—founded on Isaiah l. 5, *The Lord hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious* : I willingly devote myself, through his grace, to his service, on a principle of love to him ; and consent to the rite which makes me his for ever. The meaning of David and Paul, then, is the same, as applied to the Messiah, *who took upon him the form of a servant*, Philip. ii. 7.

33. *Dates of the principal epochs in the Old and New Testament histories.*

Epochs of the Old Testament history.

B.C.

Heb. text.

4004 Creation of the world.*

2349 Deluge.

2247 Babel built, and confusion of tongues.

2217 Assyrian empire founded by Nimrod ; Nineveh by Ninus.

* According to the Hebrew text, 4,004 ; Septuagint, 5,872 ; Samaritan, 4,700. With these dates of the creation, the year of any other event according to the common Hebrew text being given, it will be easy to ascertain the Septuagint and Samaritan dates. Hale and the best later divines shew satisfactorily the Samaritan to be the true reckoning.

- B.C.
 Heb. text.
 2188 Egypt by Misraim.
 1921 Call of Abraham.
 1896 Isaac born.
 1825 Jacob and Esau born.
 1729 Joseph sold into Egypt.
 1571 Birth of Moses.
 1491 Exodus.
 1451 Death of Moses.
 Entrance into Canaan.
 1171 Birth of Samuel.
 1079 Saul made king.
 1055 David king.
 1033 Solomon king.
 980 Revolt of the ten tribes.
 721 Destruction of Samaria, and ten tribes captive.
 606 Beginning of the Babylonish captivity. Daniel and Ezekiel
 captives.
 588 Destruction of Jerusalem.
 536 Return from the captivity.
 445 Ezra restores the law.
 428 Nehemiah rebuilds the city.
 Haggai. Zachariah.
 397 Malachi, the last prophet.
 301 Battle of Ipsus, and division of Alexander's empire.
 277 Translation of the Septuagint.
 170 Antiochus Epiphanes shuts the temple.
 166 Judas Maccabeus retakes Jerusalem.
 135 Apocrypha ends.
 44 Cæsar killed.
 31 Augustus emperor.
 18 Herod the Great begins to repair the temple.

Epochs of the New Testament history.

- 31 Augustus emperor.
 6 Gabriel announces to Zachariah the birth of John.
 5 And, six months after, to Mary, that of Jesus.
 4 John the Baptist born. Christ the Saviour born, four years
 before the vulgar era.
 A.D.
 3 Death of Herod the Great. Archelaus reigns over half his
 domains, and is banished A.D. 6.

A.D.

- 6 Herod Antipas tetrarch of Galilee.
- 8 Christ in the temple at twelve years of age.
- 14 Death of Augustus. Tiberius emperor.
- 27 Pontius Pilate procurator of Judea.
- 27 John the Baptist preaches, and baptizes Christ. Christ begins his public ministry.
- 27 First passover. John cast into prison.
- 28 Second passover. Twelve apostles chosen. John beheaded.
- 29 Third passover. Third year of the seventieth week of Daniel. Seventy disciples sent out. Christ enters Jerusalem.
- 30 Fourth passover. Fourth year, i. e. day, or middle of Daniel's seventieth and last week: see Dan. ix. 27. Christ is crucified.
- Pentecost, and gift of tongues.
- 34 Death of Stephen, and persecution.
- 35 Conversion of St. Paul.
- 37 Caligula emperor. Matthew writes his gospel in Hebrew.
- 38 Conversion of Cornelius, and first call of the Gentiles.
- 41 Disciples first called Christians.
- Claudius emperor. Mark writes his gospel.
- Herod Agrippa the first, son of the tetrarch, beheads James the greater.
- 54 Nero emperor. First persecution of Christians.
- 62 Herod Agrippa the second is almost converted by St. Paul.
- 67 Paul and Peter put to death.
- 68 Galba, Otho, Vitellius, emperors.
- 70 Vespasian emperor.
- Jerusalem taken.
- 79 Titus emperor.
- 81 Domitian emperor.
- 93 Josephus died.
- 95 Date of the Apocalypse.
- 98 Trajan emperor.
- 100 Death of John and of Clement.

34. *Καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, κτλ., Matt. xvii. 2.*

By our Lord's transfiguration it was intended to disclose the beginning, or a specimen, of our Lord's glorious kingdom, agreeably to his promise in the last words of the preceding chapter: *there be some here which shall not taste of death till they*

see the Son of Man in his kingdom. His divinity and pre-existence were likewise had in view ; for his Father then *glorified him with the glory he had with him before the world began*, John xvii. 5. But we here learn also the state of the world of spirits — that it is an intermediate state, and that it is a state of recognition ; for as Moses and Elias spake to their Master there, we too shall know even as we are known (1 Cor. xiii. 12), — that it is a state likewise of intuitive knowledge ; for the three apostles had not seen Moses and Elias, yet knew them, — and, lastly, that it is a state where the saints of different, and of all ages of the world, shall dwell together in glorified and imperishable bodies eternally.

35. *Boundaries of Galilee ; and why Upper Galilee was called Galilee of the Gentiles.*

Galilee contained four tribes ; Issachar, Zabulon, Naphtali, Asher, and part of Dan. It likewise included a small part of Peræa *beyond Jordan*. It was bounded on the south by Samaria ; on the west by the coasts of Tyre and Sidon ; on the north by Mount Libanus ; and on the east by Abilene, Ituræa, Trachonitis, and Decapolis. The northern parts, or Upper Galilee (partly that in Peræa), were called Galilee of the Gentiles, or nations (Is. ix. 1, 2, Matt. iv. 15, 16), because its mountainous nature enabled a mixed body of heathens to keep possession of its fastnesses. It is mentioned in the prophecy of Isaiah (ix. 1, 2), with reference to the Messiah, as a light to lighten the Gentiles ; and in Mark (vii. 31), Jesus is recorded to have gone on one occasion through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis.

36. *Life and death of Pontius Pilate.*

Pontius Pilate was appointed Roman governor of Judea A.D. 26, and commanded there ten years. Though convinced of Christ's innocence, he condemned him to death to avoid a charge of protecting a rebel, which would have ruined him before Cæsar. For his oppression and cruelties he was recalled by Tiberius, and banished into Gaul, where he slew himself A.D. 37.

37. *Prophecy of Christ's preaching first in Galilee.*

As our Lord dwelt with his parents at Nazareth (in Zabulon), and with Peter at Capernaum (which was called his own city) in Naphtali, the prophecy of Isaiah (ix. 1, 2) was literally fulfilled: *the land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea* (i. e. the sea of Galilee), *beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; the people which sat in darkness saw a great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up*, Matt. iv. 15, 16.

38. *Miracles and prophecies: their difference.*

Prophecies and miracles together form the external evidence of Christianity. Prophecy is the inspired prediction of future events: a miracle is an effect produced contrary to the established constitution and course of things. Prophecy, when it stands alone, requires time to produce full conviction; for men cannot be sure, until the event foretold comes to pass, that the prophet spoke with the authority of God: miracle produces immediate conviction; but this mainly affects the actual beholders, for to all others it is matter of testimony. Prophecy addresses itself to posterity: miracle to the age and place where it is wrought. Prophecy, however, supported by miracle, gives immediate confidence in the teacher, and stamps divine authority on all his declarations. Jointly they present the highest evidence of supernatural communion with the Deity. Their efficacy with regard to posterity proves the wisdom of God in conjoining them as proofs of his truth; for as the evidence of miraculous facts is traditional to all but beholders, it is somewhat impaired by every age through which the tradition descends. The evidence of prophecy, on the other hand, increases with the progress of ages, as facts foretold are successively developed. Thus the evidences are preserved in *equilibrio*, and a harmony is maintained in this part of the Divine dispensations.

39. *The flight into Egypt fulfilling a prophecy.*

Out of Egypt have I called my Son, is referred to by St. Matthew (ii. 15) as a prophecy of Hosea (xi. 11); but in this,

and some other places, the words *that it may be fulfilled*, are to be taken as meaning, "thus was fulfilled." "Iva, a conjunction, often denotes the event, and not the cause (Burton on Matt. i. 22): it is a particle, signifying "to the end that," and also "so that." It does not appear that Hosea knew he was prophesying; but as events are developed, the inspired evangelist declares that the words were those of unconscious inspiration. The evangelist, however, does not apply them by *accommodation*, as the rationalists construe. They first, and literally, related to the Exodus; but, in a secondary sense and typical accomplishment, it is shewn that Christ is God's Son, his first-born, and Israel; as in Isaiah xlix. 3.

40. *Καὶ εὐθέως ἀποστείλας ὁ βασιλεὺς σπεκουλάτωρα, κτλ., Mark vi. 27. Executioners called σπεκουλάτορες.*

Burton is decidedly wrong in deriving *σπεκουλάτωρ* from *spicula*, a dart or javelin, like an ear of corn; for a javelin would not *behead*: *σπεκουλάτωρ* comes from the Hebrew *הרש* — whence our words *scope*, *sceptic*, &c.; and the Greek *σκέπτομαι*; but in Latin, by metathesis, *specio* and *speculator*, to look about; a word applied to body-guards, because their chief office was that of sentinels. See Wetstein, &c.

They were employed, likewise, as Turkish soldiers of the present day are, in capital punishments, and particularly in beheading.

41. *Was St. Paul's fight with wild beasts in the theatre of Ephesus literal or figurative?*

Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian, think that St. Paul's fighting with wild beasts at Ephesus is literal; and some modern divines consider 2 Cor. i. 8-10, to allude to some extreme peril at Ephesus. But St. Luke would not omit so singular a fact in writing the Acts; and Acts xix. 23 only alludes to the tumult raised by Demetrius, to which the above passage of 2 Cor. i. 8-10 may easily be attributed. The *κατ' ἀνθρώπον* limits the signification; and in the absence of all positive proof, the phrase, must be construed figuratively, as describing the opponents of

the apostle's doctrine. Here Dr. Sisson takes the literal sense for granted; and gives a poor explanation, not applicable to the subject.

42. *St. Paul's free citizenship of Rome.*

See Art. 4. The freedom of Rome (claimed by Paul when about to be scourged in the Prætorium) might be obtained by money, merit, or favour. When purchased, as by the captain of the guard, who seems to have been a Greek (Acts xxi. 27), the price was considerable, ἐγὼ πολλοῦ κεφαλαίου ἐκτησάμην. When this man wondered that a man of so mean an appearance, who had told him he was a Jew of Tarsus (Acts xxi. 39), should be a Roman citizen, Paul replies, *I am free by birth*. The people of Tarsus had taken part with Julius Cæsar; in consequence of which Anthony made them free, and Augustus confirmed their privileges. Tarsus was thus *no mean city* (Acts xxi. 39), and was called Juliopolis. Appian *de Bell. Civil.* p. 1077; Dio Chrys. xvii. p. 508.

43. *Distinguish the two Antiochs of the New Testament.*

There were several cities (i. e. fourteen, Sisson) called Antioch, built by the Seleucidæ, in the East; but the principal two, founded by Antiochus Soter, the son of Seleucus, king of Syria and Asia, were Antioch in Syria, on the Orontes, his capital, and Antioch in Pisidia, the capital city of that province.

At Antioch in Pisidia the apostles Paul and Barnabas preached, and converted many Jews; but were expelled from the city by their unbelieving brethren, Acts xiii. 14, &c.

Antioch in Syria is distinguished as the city where the disciples were first called Christians (A.D. 41, Acts xi. 26), having previously been termed Nazarenes by the Jews, and Galileans by the Gentiles—both as terms of reproach. This Antioch was the birth-place of St. Luke (Euseb. lib. iii. c. 4), and of its celebrated bishop and martyr Ignatius, who suffered in the year

107 at Rome, under Trajan, being exposed to wild beasts when upwards of one hundred years old. Evans' *Scripture Biography*.

44. *Absolution, or power of the keys, as founded on Matt. xvi. 19.*

The Romish heresy has built on this passage its double error of making the popes, as the (pretended) successors of Peter, the vicegerents of Christ on earth; and pronouncing that idolatrous church infallible in its sentences, particularly in regard to absolution. See Burton on the Power of the Keys; and sermon in the Preacher, No. 201, by the Rev. J. Grant, 1834.

Now, some divines think that our Saviour resolved to build his church, as on a rock (Peter or Cephas, Greek and Syriac, signifying a rock or stone), not on Peter's authority, but on the principle just before advanced by him (Matt. xvi. 16), that Jesus was the Christ, ὁ Χριστός, the Son of the living God. According to other commentators, as Christ addressed the question, *Whom say ye that I am?* to his apostles in general, Peter was only the spokesman of them all; and the rock on which the church should be built was the whole apostolic college.

But as the former interpretation seems hardly reconcileable to the personal address to Peter, and to the paronomasia on his name; and as the latter is contrary to the obvious sense of the passage; we are willing to admit, that on Peter's preaching, the church should rest as its foundation,—a promise fulfilled at the first Pentecost, when, by Peter's preaching to the *Jews*, three thousand souls were gained; and afterwards, at Cæsarea, when at the baptizing of Cornelius, he gathered the *first-fruits* of the *Gentiles*.

The gates of hell shall not prevail against my church, signifies that death—the gate of hades—shall not shut out true believers from everlasting life.

On this declaration, popery has established a right of its bishops, as successors of St. Peter, to be the supreme heads of

the Christian church. But Eusebius only says (lib. i. c. 19), "After the death of Peter and Paul, *Linus* was the *first* bishop of Rome." Nor had Peter any supremacy over any other apostle. Paul withstood him to his face at Antioch; and when the apostles called him before them, to account for his intercourse with the Gentiles, he acknowledged their authority, by pleading his cause before them. In the first Council of Jerusalem, *James*, the metropolitan bishop, and not Peter, occupied the chair, and arbitrated on the question of Judaizing. Peter, with his accustomed ardour, had counselled an unlimited exemption of the Jewish converts from all the Mosaic ordinances; but James (the less) qualified this counsel by requiring them to abstain from meats offered to idols, through fear of giving offence to Jews of weak consciences,—*Men and brethren, hear me* (Acts xv.); and in this decision Peter and the rest acquiesced.

Next, as to absolution, or the power of the keys. Peter was the individual immediately addressed; but here all the twelve were evidently included: for in Matthew xviii. 18, our Lord told them, *Whatsoever ye shall bind or loose on earth, shall be bound or loosed in heaven*; a power again imparted before the ascension, when Jesus breathed on them, and said, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit or retain, they are remitted or retained*.

The power, then, was equally imparted to all the apostles; and, though in a very modified manner, to the ministers of Christ, as their successors. Among the miraculous gifts communicated to the earliest rulers of the church, St. Paul mentions the discerning of spirits. That Peter was endowed with this gift is evident from his detecting the hypocrisy of Ananias and Sapphira; but St. Paul's words (1 Cor. xii. 10) shew that it was common to the apostles and others. The apostles, then, acting on the principle that the sins of a *sincere* penitent are forgiven through Christ, could confidently exercise the power of absolution, because they were enabled to look into the heart, and to discern whether the penitent were truly sincere. No minister of Christ can now confidently apply this rule to an individual penitent; for the like reason, that they cannot discern the spirit, or know its sincerity. Consequently, *their* pronuncia-

tion of absolution can be only conditional: if otherwise, it would be the daring usurpation of a prerogative belonging only to the great Searcher of hearts.

The ancient form of absolution was supplicatory; and even then not till penitence was manifested in overt acts of holiness. The absolute form, "I absolve thee," was not introduced until near the time of Thomas Aquinas in the 12th century.

In the English liturgy there are three forms of absolution; the first at the beginning of morning and evening prayer, which is a *truism*; a declaration on the part of God that *he* pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and believe. The second occurs in the communion, or sacramental service, and is a prayer, "*may He* pardon," &c. The third is that in the office for visiting the sick, which the Catholics say is as strong as any absolution of theirs. But this, though its strong language implies that the sincerity of a dying man's penitence is not to be doubted, and though it pours consolation into his breast in that dread extremity, amounts not to the presumption of the Romish priesthood. It is still conditional, for it is followed by a prayer that God would open the eye of his mercy on that sick servant, who earnestly *desires* pardon and forgiveness; a prayer which would be superfluous on the supposition of a judicial acquittal from the priest. Men *desire* that which they have not; not that which they have already.

45. Οἱ μάρτυρες ἀπέθεντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, κτλ, Acts vii. 58. *The meaning of μάρτυρες. The difference between ἱμάτιον and χιτῶν.*

A worshipper of strange gods was by the Mosaic law stoned to death; but only by the testimony of two witnesses, Deut. xvii. 2-7. *The hands of the witnesses shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hands of all the people,* Deut. xvii. 17.

The witnesses cast the first stone to denote their responsibility for the transaction. The loose garments were necessarily laid aside, to obtain greater freedom for the office, Deut. xxii. 23. The inner garment was *χιτών*, a vest or tunic, Matt. v. 40,

Luke vi. 29: *ἱμάτιον* was the mantle or outer garment, which both Hesiod and Virgil shew that husbandmen in warm countries threw aside in ploughing, sowing, and reaping. In John xix. 2, the soldiers divided the *ἱμάτιον* of Jesus into four parts; but cast lots for the seamless *χιτών*. Persons stoned by a decree of the Sanhedrim were dashed down a small eminence to fall on a great stone; and if not killed, a witness threw another large stone on the offender (Brown's *Antiq.*). This explains Matt. xxi. 44, *Whosoever shall fall on this stone, &c., and on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.*

46. Jewish days and nights. Watches in the night.

The Hebrews computed their day from evening to evening (Levit. xxiii. 32), probably in memory of the creation; for darkness was before light (Exod. xii. 18), *and the evening and the morning were one day*. Some think that this computation only began at the Exodus, to distinguish the Hebrews from the idolatrous nations of the East, who began the day with the sun-rising. In Daniel viii. 14, a day is called *בֵּקֶר עֶרֶב*, the same as the Greek *νυχθήμερον*; as in English we say se'nnight, fortnight.

This was the *sacred* day; but there was also a civil or working day, corresponding with light, for God called the light day (Gen. i. 5); and this day was divided latterly into twelve hours. This commenced when dials were introduced from Babylon, whence Ahaz received one B.C. 713, 2 Kings xx. 11, Is. xxxviii. 8. *Are there not twelve hours in the day?* John xi. 9, where it is evidently the time of light. But as the length of the day, or time of light, varied in different seasons of the year, so the twelve hours varied in length. See the parable of hiring labourers into the vineyard. This civil day was generally computed from six in the morning, particularly at the time of the passover, which was the equinox; and hence St. Matthew writes (xxviii. 1), *In the evening of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week.*

It appears from Nehemiah (ix. 3), that the civil or working day was divided into four parts, varying in length as the hours and seasons varied.

The night was originally divided into three parts or watches, Psalm lxiii. 6, xc. 4, Sam. ii. 19; middle watch, Judges vii. 19; morning watch, Exod. xiv. 24.

In the time of our Saviour a fourth watch was introduced from the Romans, Matt. xiv. 25, Mark vi. 48.

N.B. The third hour of the day was our nine A.M. (Mark xv. 25); the sixth our twelve at noon (Luke xxiii. 44); and the ninth our three P.M. (Matt. xxvii. 45), the time of evening sacrifice beginning. St. John (xix. 14) states that Christ stood before Pilate about (ὥσει) the sixth hour. Burton is wrong in saying, Mark says (xv. 25) ῥπλῖη; for Mark applies ῥπλῖη to the crucifixion, three hours afterwards. John had just before said (xviii. 25), it was *early* when Christ was brought before Pilate. St. John used the Roman notation, which, by the time of his writing his Gospel, had become established. Burton says this will not solve the difficulty: with submission, I maintain it completely solves the difficulty. Bloomfield says, the true reading is Γ, ῥπλῖη, mistaken for ς, and quotes several MSS.; but this ῥπλῖη is applied by the other evangelists to the crucifixion, and no time is left (if at the same ῥπλῖη Christ was judged) for the sending of Jesus to Herod, with his return for the remainder of the trial, and the slow and painful passage along the Via Dolorosa.

Adam (*Roman Antiq.* p. 332) says, the Roman civil day was from midnight to midnight. John's sixth hour was six in the morning, i. e. *early*, and corresponds well to the transactions of the whole preceding night, and the denial of Peter at the cock-crowing (*gallicinium*), which was at the third watch, or three in the morning.

47. *Christ without sin. Doctrine of our Articles.*

In the fifteenth article Christ is said to be like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his spirit; and that being thus a Lamb without spot, he was fitted by the sacrifice of himself to take away the sins of the world. This article is founded in Scripture; for *we have not an High-Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but he was in all points*

tempted like as we are, yet without sin. 1 Peter ii. 22, *Christ did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.* On the other hand, all men are sinners, and have need of an atonement; for *there is none righteous, no, not one,* Rom. iii. 10. *All we like sheep have gone astray . . . and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,* Isa. liii. 6. If he had had any sin, he would have required a Redeemer, as well as all men; but (1 John iii. 5) *ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him was no sin.*

48. Title of the “Son of Man,” applied to Christ and to Ezekiel.

The title of Son of Man, applied by Christ to himself, and never by any other person in the New Testament, except once by the dying St. Stephen (Acts vii. 56), occurs sixty-one times in the Gospels. It is taken from Dan. vii. 13, 14, where that name is applied to the Messiah, and everlasting and universal dominion is given to him. The corresponding title, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, shews that this belongs to Christ *κατ’ ἐξοχήν*; and both taken together evince the union of his divine and human natures. Against the Gnostics, who affirmed that he was man alone until his baptism, when a spiritual and divine influence united itself to him, and against the Socinians, who wholly deny his divinity, it proves that he was very man and very God. Bishop Middleton says, that this title is employed by our Saviour in speaking of his present humiliation or his future glory, shewing that the human nature did not originally belong to him. Bloomfield’s Synopsis on Matthew viii. 20, and Middleton on the Greek Article.

Ezekiel is called Son of Man ninety times in his prophecies, because they were visions communicated to him by Jehovah, who gave him that title, Ezek. ii. 1. God, in holding personal intercourse with a mortal creature, would humble his pride, and bring to his remembrance (Psalm viii. 4), *what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him?* מֶלֶךְ is always considered as more humiliating (as in Psalm viii. 4, Dan. ii. 1) than שֶׁפֶל; yet St. Paul (Heb. ii. 6) applies this lowly expression to the Saviour—humbled and exalted.

49. *Roman punishment for sedition.*

"Auctores seditionis et tumultûs, concitato populo, pro qualitate dignitatis, aut in crucem tolluntur (as slaves), aut bestiis subjiiciuntur" (as rebels).—Wetstein on Matt. xxvii. 22.

The Jews arraigned our Lord for blasphemy before Caiaphas, of which the punishment by their law was stoning, Levit. xxiv. 14; but as the power of capital punishment had passed from them, they next accused him before the Roman governor of sedition, and calling himself king (Luke xxiii. 2); or of stirring up the people (Luke xxiii. 5); for which he was scourged and crucified. Paul and Silas were scourged and imprisoned at Philippi for troubling the city, Acts xvi. 20, 23. Barabbas had been cast into prison for sedition, Luke xxiii. 19.

50. *Divinity of the Holy Ghost.*

Ananias, Satan hath filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost (Acts v. 3), compared with ver. 4, Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, &c.; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God, Luke i. 35. Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? 1 Cor. iii. 16.

51. *Christianity not an invention of the apostles.*

We are here to consider, 1st, The system and plan of Christianity; and, 2d, The persons who are supposed to have devised it.

Christianity was a system intended to overthrow all the false religions of the world, and to bring in a new era; to put an end to the ordinances of the Jewish law, by introducing a new explanation of them; humbling to the pride of those who expected temporal dominion and prosperity; and irksome to the carnal affections of those who were now taught to spiritualise in their mind all those outward ceremonies in which they had concentrated their obedience. It was intended to silence the wisest philosophers, and to draw them into its light by convincing them of their darkness. It was intended to produce a thorough

moral reformation in the whole world—to propose an eternity of happiness, prepared, not for the conquering warrior, the brilliant orator, the proud philosopher, the wealthy giver of largesses; but for the peace-makers, the merciful, the pure in heart—to substitute purity of thought for ostentation of conduct—to preach a religion, to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness. It was intended to unfold the moral disease of man, and to propose the remedies—to reveal mysterious doctrines, suited to the wants of men—to clear up doubt—to console sorrow—to make death welcome—and to adapt itself to all ages, countries, conditions, and characters.

Now, secondly, who are supposed to have devised so *magnificent* a scheme?—Twelve simple men, illiterate fishermen and mechanics; too honest in their general character to incur the suspicion of imposture; endowed with plain sense, but not gifted with scholastic literature or intellectual cultivation; men, too, replete with Jewish prejudices. Such was the rush that was to be a lever to overturn the world, and that too (according to the sceptic's hypothesis) without supernatural assistance; for the moment such assistance is mentioned, the supposition of imposture is given up. God would not yield assistance to impostors; and Satan also would not assist men employed in overturning his own kingdom.

These men, to form so wild a plan with means so weak, must have been the most presumptuous of all impostors; and the more so, if they considered the opposition they might every where expect—from magisterial power, priestly interest, Jewish prejudice, and pagan depravity; or, when they began to experience opposition, incarceration, stripes, torture, rejection, and mockery, without any enjoyment of advantage, or any hope of earthly good in return (for, on the supposition of a lie, hope of heaven was out of the question), they must, to avoid death, have returned to silence. Yet we know they bore and courted the most ignominious and cruel deaths. What else could they expect, with the death of their leader before their eyes? What else did they continually experience? and yet without retraction.

If there had been a compact of deceit among the apostles,

their different characters and occasional differences would have broken it. They could not have been all consistent in the common falsehood; some one would have blabbed, or become fainthearted, or contradicted himself. Again, if they forged the New Testament history, they must have forged the Old; they must have accompanied and dictated prophecy in all ages; lived with Adam, Abraham, Moses, David, and the prophets; arranged all the types and sacrifices; and influenced Daniel to fix even the precise time of the Messiah's appearance. But the Old Testament existed in the Greek of the Septuagint two hundred years before the apostles; and we know that the New is a continuation and fulfilment of the Old Testament.

The character of the apostles, if they had invented Christianity, must have been that at once of the most virtuous and the most wicked of men. Either disbelieving a future state, and daily braving death which would terminate prematurely in torments the only life they had to enjoy; or having some faint notion of futurity, and of its rewards to virtue, their whole life must have been one continued scene of perjury, their solemn declarations blasphemy, and their whole behaviour madness. Nor would the impiety of such a course have been inferior to its inhumanity—that of persuading men to leave all, and to lay down their lives in support of one they knew to be an impostor. Christianity is a system of spiritual freedom by truth, and of love to God and man. Can all the advocacy of truth as essential to salvation come from the lips of deliberate falsehood—all that breathes benevolence from the heart of wickedness? To all this we add the success of the Gospel, as a proof that neither the apostles, nor any power merely human, could have framed it; as a proof that it came from, and was supported by, God. If it were not supported and forwarded by miracles, its wonderful and rapid success without them is itself a greater miracle than any we are called upon to believe.

Se 'l mondo si revolve al' Christianesimo
Diss' io, senza miracoli, quest' uno
E tal', che gli altri non sono 'l centesimo.

DANTE, *Paradiso*, cant. xxiv.

52. *The principal religious sects of modern times ; their pretended groundwork in Scripture ; and scriptural answers.*

The chief sects relate —

I. To the Trinity ; and are, Arians, Socinians, Moravians, and Swedenbourgians as being Sabellians.

II. To the extent of the atonement ; Calvinists, Antinomians, and Universalists.

III. To church-government ; Presbyterians and Independents.

IV. To the mode and age adapted to baptism ; Baptists and Antipædobaptists (including Sabbatarian Baptists), Quakers.

V. To the nature and extent of spiritual influence ; Methodists.

VI. To the future prospects of the church ; Millenarians, including Southcotians, Irvingites, &c.

CLASS I.—*Trinity.*

The *Arians* believe the Son to be the first of all created beings, but not one with the Father, and not equal to him ; and they rest their notions on such texts as the following :—*Why callest thou me good ? there is none good but one, that is God*, Matt. xix. 17 ; *to sit on my right and my left hand is not mine to give*, Mark x. 27 ; *of that day and that hour knoweth no man, neither the Son, but the Father*, Mark xiii. 32 ; *all power is given unto me*, Matt. xxviii. 18 ; *then shall the Son also himself be subject unto Him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all*, 1 Cor. xv. 28. These texts, they think, argue a manifest inferiority in the second Person. But their error consists in confounding the Divinity with the manhood of Christ. That may be true of the former, which may not be predicable as to the latter : for instance, omniscience, and inherent power. And what can they make of *I and the Father are one*, John x. 30 ; or, *he that hath seen me hath seen the Father* ? John xiv. 9.

The *Socinians* allow no pre-existing state of being to Christ

before he came into the world at Bethlehem. Their text, *Thou art my Son ; this day have I begotten thee* (Psalm ii. 7), is a mere quibble—a commodity in which they deal. We oppose to it, *glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was*, John xvii. 5 ; and, *what and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before ?* John vi. 62. They rest on the phrase, *the Son of man*, Matt. viii. 20 ; but forget that Jesus is also *the Son of God*, Mark i. 1 ; and as such brought on himself the enmity of the Jews.

The Socinians also deny the atonement, and quote the words, *when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness, he shall save his soul alive* (Ezek. xviii. 27), as a proof that repentance alone shall save a soul. But—*what shall I do to be saved ? Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved*, Acts xvi. 31 ; *neither is there salvation in any other*, Acts iv. 12. Belief includes repentance on the orthodox system, but confesses its insufficiency of itself to work out salvation.

The Moravians admit the Trinity ; but address their prayers and hymns principally to the second Person, on the strength of the text, *at the name of Jesus every knee should bow*, Phil. ii. 10 ; to which there is no objection, if it only be remembered that the words were taken from Isaiah xlv. 22, 23, where *God the Father speaks—I am God : unto me every knee shall bow ; every tongue shall swear*. We are to worship God as an invisible Spirit, the Creator and Preserver : prayers and hymns addressed to the second Person are apt to forget the attributes of his spirituality, and to beget an unbecoming familiarity with the *man* Jesus.

The modern disciples of Swedenbourg have revived the Sabellian heresy, and unite the whole Godhead in the second Person ; citing the very text which has been urged above against the Arians, *believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me ?* John xiv. 11. But here the distinct personality of the three in one is overlooked ; as in the context of John xvii. 21, *that thou hast sent me*. How can this explain the baptism of Jesus, when all the three Persons were separately engaged ?—the Divine Son being baptized ; the Spirit of God hovering ; and the voice coming from the Father. The Father

plans salvation; the Son executes; the Holy Ghost applies. *No man hath seen God (the Father) at any time: the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared (ἐξηγήσατο, disclosed) him, John i. 18. When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, he shall testify of me, John xv. 26.*

CLASS II.—*Atonement, extent of.*

The Calvinists hold their *five points*: 1. Absolute predestination; 2. Partial redemption; 3. Total depravation; 4. Irresistible grace; 5. Indefectible grace.

As these are principally combined in the first, unconditional predestination, we shall rest on that chiefly. The grand stronghold of Calvinism is the text Rom. viii. 29, 30, *for whom he did foreknow, he did also predestinate* [to be] (this is not in the original, and προώρισε συμμόρφους is more accurately *fore-ordained, BEING*) *conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.*

1. No one denies the foreknowledge of God; and if he foreknew those who should be conformed to the image of his Son, he may be said to have predetermined their salvation, without a fetter on their option to embrace or to reject his offer of salvation. 2. But in opposition to *partial redemption* (the second point), God invites all sinners, and opens salvation to them; *he is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance, 2 Pet. iii. 9; he will have all men to be saved, 1 Tim. ii. 4.* 3. Again, as to the third point, his invitations and warnings presuppose a mind *not totally depraved*, since it has the power of closing with grace; *the Spirit worketh, wherefore work out your own salvation; and the Spirit witnesseth (not IN, but) WITH our spirits, that we are children of God, Phil. ii. 12, Rom. viii. 16.* 4. In regard to the fourth point, as the mind has the correlative power of rejecting grace, it *cannot be irresistible*: men may receive the grace of God in vain; they may quench the Spirit, and grieve

it, 2 Cor. vi. 1, 1 Thess. v. 19, Ephes. iv. 30. 5. And in reply to the last point, as even St. Paul, chosen and called of God, feared lest he should be cast away (1 Cor. ix. 27), *grace cannot be indefectible*. But all this is a deep mystery.

Fixed fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute ;
And found no end, in wandering mazes lost.

MILTON, *Par. Lost*, b. ii. l. 556.

Yet the same poet, though a reputed Calvinist, says, absolutely—

Hadst thou the same free-will and power to stand ?
Thou hadst. B. iv. l. 66.

And as this would only shew him to be not a *supralapsarian* Calvinist, he passes from Satan to Adam—

Happiness in his power left free to will.—B. v. l. 235.

The *Antinomians* carry out the Calvinistic principle of indefectible grace to the utmost extravagance ; but, indeed, there are Arminian Antinomians. They rest upon the text, or rather the half text, *there is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus*, Rom. viii. 1 ; but they here close the book, and shut their eyes to the ending,—*who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit*. The Antinomians say, that as the elect cannot fall from grace, or lose the Divine favour, the wicked actions they commit are not really sinful, or violations of the Divine law ; and consequently they have no occasion to confess their sins, or break them off by repentance. They hold that the imputed righteousness of Christ makes believers as righteous as he, since he has taken the whole of our sins, even the sin of our impenitence—that is, of the elect—upon himself, or expiated them by his sufferings. They quote Rom. iv. 6, setting forth the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works ; and ver. 5, with several other texts ; where the works mentioned are evidently the works of the ceremonial law. The expressions in Rom. iii. 20, Gal. ii. 16, only shew that justification is not by moral works, but by *faith* ; but the error consists in forgetting that faith without works is dead, being alone, James ii. 17.

According to the *Universalists*, punishment in the hands of

God is not vindictive, but corrective; and all men, when sufficiently purified by punishment, will finally be made happy in eternity.

They say that *αἰώνιον*, applied to punishment, signified only *age-lasting*, a limited time, Matt. xxv. 46; but the *αἰώνιον* in the former part of the verse, applied to happiness, they allow to be everlasting, and thus refute themselves; for whatever may be the meaning in the one case must be the same in the other.

Their leading texts are: *as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive*, 1 Cor. xv. 22. And all *shall* verily be made alive, but the wicked unto eternal damnation, Mark iii. 29. They quote Coloss. i. 20, where Christ is said to *reconcile all things unto himself*: that is, we reply, to give *all men* an opportunity of recovering what they lost in Adam, and to save all but those who are determined of *themselves* to perish; where the worm *never* dieth, and the fire is *not quenched*, Mark ix. 44.

CLASS III.—Church-government.

The *Presbyterians* maintain that church-government ought to be carried on by a rising scale of courts, from the kirk-session to the presbytery, the synod, and the general assembly. In these assemblies there is a president or *moderator*, with a higher chair *pro tempore*, as James the First said of Henderson's at Glasgow; but they allow of no *permanent* authority over churches vested *ex officio* in one man, who shall ordain, confirm, and rule; and deny such an office to have been appointed by Christ; holding that presbyter and bishop mean the same thing—the only order in the church, and no one having a rank above the others. Their deacons are accordingly laymen.

They support these sentiments by 1 Pet. v. 1, *the elders* (presbyters) *I exhort, who am a fellow-presbyter*; and various passages in the Acts. And as to ordination, and the conferring of any religious gifts, they refer to 1 Tim. iv. 14, *the laying on of the hands of the presbytery*. In 1 Tim. iii. mention only is made of bishops and deacons, shewing a bishop and presbyter to be the same.

We reply, that while Christ lived—the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls—the apostles only prayed *the Lord of the harvest, that he should send forth labourers into his harvest*, Matt. ix. 38. Christ, who ordained the twelve apostles, and seventy inferior teachers, formed the platform of the Christian church on the model of the Mosaic institutions—high-priest or chief-priest, priests, and Levites. But as Christ was leaving the world, he communicated powers to his apostles: *as my Father hath sent me, so send I you: and he breathed on them, and they received the Holy Ghost*, John xx. 21.

Soon after, they began to ordain presbyters (Acts xiv. 23), and deacons to serve tables—not laymen; for Philip the deacon baptised the Samaritan converts, and baptism is an ecclesiastical office, Acts viii. 5. Yet these deacons could not confirm or ordain; for Peter and John went down to complete the work of Philip, Acts viii. 14.

In 1 Tim. iii., Acts xx. 28, and Phil. i. 1, it is true bishops are mentioned as presbyters; but every bishop is a presbyter, though every presbyter may not be a bishop; and the meaning of the word may not at that time have been exclusively applied to the office of overseer in the church. Yet that order may be still bishops, priests, and deacons, which at first was, 1. apostles, and after them bishops, being also presbyters; 2. presbyters, not being bishops; and 3. deacons.

The *Independents* hold that every congregation is a church within itself, having power to regulate itself, and acknowledging no external authority, either of a bishop or a presbytery. They rely chiefly on 1 Tim. iii. 5, *if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?* But here *ἐκκλησία* is without the definite article. The comparison is inapplicable, the first clause referring to a private household; while the second relates to an integral portion of the *general church*. This last is what we mean in 1 Cor. xvi. 19, *the church that is in their house*; but less than we mean in Ephes. i. 22, *Christ is the head over all things to the church*. Again, they urge, *let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another*, Gal. vi. 4. It is added (though referring to a man's domestic concerns), *he that is*

spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man, 1 Cor. ii. 15; while the gradual process from private admonition to a few witnesses, and then to the church, mentioned in Matt. xviii. 15-17, is averred only to allude to a single congregation.

But Paul was an *ἐπίσκοπος*, bishop, in the strictest sense, for he had *the care of all the churches*, 2 Cor. xi. 28. He likewise sent for the elders of Ephesus to meet him, that they might receive an episcopal charge at Miletus, and *they* confessed his superior authority. He appointed Titus bishop of Crete, an officer having power to ordain presbyters in every city, and to set things in order, Titus i. 5. St. John assumes authority over the seven churches. Titus was not chosen by the congregation, but appointed by Paul, to reject heretics, and consequently to judge of heresy, Titus iii. 10. James the less, as bishop of Jerusalem, gave sentence in a council, to which all acceded as authoritative, Acts xv. 13.

If there were presbyters before in Crete, with power of ordaining, there was no occasion to settle Titus there; and if none, the ministers were called, *not* by the congregation, but by a superior and extraneous authority. Timothy was placed at Ephesus as its bishop for the same purpose, not by a call from the people, but by the imposition of Paul's hands.

CLASS IV.—*Baptism: Mode and Age.*

The *Baptists* form the third branch of those properly called Dissenters; the Independents and Presbyterians being the two others. They are general and particular, the latter being Calvinists. They do not consider sprinkling to be baptism; and they rely on the history of our Saviour's baptism in the river Jordan, and that of the Ethiopian who descended to a river. βαπτίζω, in all the texts where it occurs, they hold as signifying *dip*, or *immerge*: so the LXX. use it; and such is its meaning in 1 Cor. x. 2, *all our Fathers were baptised in the Red Sea*. Moreover, as a sign of purification, since *the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint* (Isa. i. 5), the symbol is thought to be not significant without immersion.

The church does not object to immersion as heretical,

but denies its necessity. It is not certain that either our Saviour or the Ethiopian was dipped: the water poured from the hollow of the hand might be sufficient. The word *baptise* is derived from βαπτῆ, a *spot* (see Hey's *Lectures*, vol. i. lect. ix.); and the washing of hands in the Gospels was only partial. The answer of our Lord to Peter at the last supper seems decisive: *he that is washed* (in order to have part with Christ) *needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit*, John xiii. 10.

The *Antipædobaptists* (being the same persons, only urging a different objection) oppose *infant* baptism, and baptise only adults; affirming that all the persons mentioned as baptised in the Gospels had come to years of responsibility, and could *personally* perform the conditions of repentance and faith annexed to the sacrament. *He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved*, Mark xvi. 16. *Repent, and be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins*, Acts ii. 38. Is it then affirmed that *children*, who cannot perform these conditions personally, are to be damned, according to the latter clause of the above verse, Mark xvi. 16? Horrible conclusion! How will this agree with the words of the meek Saviour himself, *Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven*, Matt. ix. 14?

The jailor of Philippi was baptised, with *his house*, Acts vi. 33. What construction do the Antipædobaptists put on 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy?* as also *the promise is to you and to your children?* Baptism was the corresponding rite to circumcision under the law; and that always took place on the eighth day after the birth of the child.

N.B. Some Baptists are *Sabbatarians*, keeping Saturday, or the old Jewish Sabbath or seventh day, and affirming it never to have been abolished. Professor Lee has shewn that Sunday was the original patriarchal Sabbath, and was changed after the Exodus. But we affirm that the first day of the week was the *Christian Sabbath*, when acts of public worship were performed, and alms laid up in store, 1 Cor. xvi. 2; and that it was called *the Lord's day* by St. John, Rev. i. 10. The spiritual

meaning of the Sabbath *was a seventh part* of time given to rest and religious reflection; and the converted Jews gave two seventh parts; which was supererogation; or a spiritual added to, not substituted for, a literal observance: but the theme of remembrance was purposely changed at the resurrection of Christ.

Quakers, or *Friends*, are classed under this head because they oppose both sprinkling and dipping (together with all external symbols), resting on an inward baptism, that of the Spirit in the heart. They number outward ordinances with "beggary elements," designed to be abolished with the other rites of the law; although Christ himself, who came to fulfil the law, actually instituted two sacramental and outward signs of inward and spiritual grace. Their text is, *But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?* Gal. iv. 9.

Another passage on which they lean is dependent on the analogy of baptism to circumcision, *But he is a Jew (Christian) which is one inwardly, and circumcision (baptism) is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter*, Rom. ii. 29. *For the letter killeth; but the Spirit giveth life*, 1 Cor. iii. 6.

To all this we oppose our Saviour's exemplification, in his own baptism, of his own command, *Go ye and teach all nations, baptising them*, Matt. xxviii. 19; and, with reference to the other sacrament, his words, *as often as ye eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do shew forth my death until I come*, 1 Cor. xi. 26. To declare what a duty is, and what it is not, is a common idiom of Scripture, not excluding the latter, but giving priority of importance to the former. Thus, *Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated*, only signifies, "Jacob have I loved before Esau." Apply this to the above text respecting the spirit and the letter, and likewise to the usual distinctions between faith and works, &c. &c.

CLASS V.—*Nature and Extent of Spiritual Influence.*

The *Methodists* pretend not to differ with the church in any of her grand doctrines, whether they be considered in the

Arminian or Calvinistic interpretation of her creed, for they are of both persuasions. The only point in which the Wesleyans seem to differ as a sect, is the *witness of the Spirit*, or an assurance of personal salvation wrought by the Holy Spirit in the heart of a believer, so that he can no more doubt of it than of his own existence.

The texts on which this doctrine is reared are, *If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater*, 1 John v. 9, 11. *He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself*, John ix. 10. *The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God*, Rom. viii. 16. *And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father*, Gal. iv. 6.

But none of these texts amount to a sanction of the doctrine of *assurance* beyond the possibility of falling away. We are desired to *make* our calling sure, 2 Peter i. 10. St. Paul feared lest he should be cast away, 1 Cor. ix. 27.

The doctrine in question encourages a deceitful reliance on feelings and excitements, very different from that joy in the Holy Ghost (1 Thess. i. 6) wrought by a reflection on our possessing the fruits of the Spirit; which are, *love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance*, Gal. v. 22, 23.

Even this *joy* ought to be with trembling (Philip. ii. 12); and the utmost we can or dare say, in our best estate, is, *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath begotten us again unto a lively hope*, 1 Peter i. 3. But hope is not assurance.

The text, *the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him* (Heb. x. 38), ought to be rendered, "if *he* draw back;" for "any man" is not in the original. So, then, a man may be just, or justified by faith, and yet draw back, or fall away into the Divine displeasure: that is, grace is not indefectible; and there is no assurance of faith.

"If pardon and justification be obtained by faith, and this faith be only an assurance that I am pardoned and justified, then I must believe that I am pardoned and justified, that I

may be pardoned and justified: that is, I must believe I am something before I am or can be that thing,—which is to believe a lie.”—*Bishop Hopkins.*

CLASS VI.—*Future Prospects of the Church.*

The *Millenarians* are those who, inquiring closely into, and explaining literally, the mysterious Apocalypse, believe that Christ will reign personally upon earth one thousand years, with the saints of the *first* resurrection, before the general resurrection and judgment. They rely on Dan. vii. 27, *And the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him*; and Rev. xx. 6, *Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.* The former of these passages only prophesies the universal extension of the peaceful reign of Christ, or of his Gospel; and the latter, with the preceding verse, *the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years were finished* (viz. of Christ's reign with his saints): *this is the first resurrection*,—evidently contains figurative matter. Whitby, Lowman, and other divines, consider the first resurrection as meaning, “from the death unto sin and the new birth unto righteousness;” and the reign of Christ with his saints, to be a prevalence of the peace and holiness of the Gospel; and the thousand years as a long period of time when the church will flourish in peace. It is difficult to see—if these years were to be taken literally, as terminating with the close of a reign of Christ and his saints of the first literal resurrection—how the certain computation of the succeeding judgment could tally with the account of that day as coming like a thief in the night when not *expected*—when men were eating and drinking, and buying and selling, as in the days of Noah and Lot. *The HOUR cometh when ALL that are in the graves shall come forth*, &c. John v. 28, 29; that is, the *whole* who are buried, and the whole at one time.

The *Southcotians*, *Irvingites*, &c. are bodies of well-meaning persons, grafting fanaticism upon millenarianism.

53. *On the demoniacs, and alleged injustice to the owners of the swine.*

The narrative in Luke (viii. 32) decides that the demoniacs were not persons labouring under mental diseases, as epilepsy, madness, &c.; since these diseases could not enter into the swine, or hold conversations with our Saviour. It shews also, that the devils are under the power of God. There was no injustice to the owners of the swine in the miracle, for swine were prohibited as unclean animals (Levit. xi. 7); and these owners, if Jews, or Gentiles feeding them for Jews, were guilty at the least of *partaking of other men's sins* (Rev. xviii. 4), and of tempting others to violate the ordinances of the *law*, still in force, Prov. i. 10, Ephes. v. 11.

54. *The Areopagus, or Mars' hill.*

The hill of Mars was a small eminence, situated in a north-west suburb of Athens, on which stood the court of Areopagus, "Ἀρειος πάγος, from "Ἀρεως, -εος, Æolic for "Ἀρης, and πάγος, either because Mars was tried there, i. e. "Ἀρης, a Thessalian prince, for the murder of Hallirhotius, who had offered violence to his daughter; or from a sacrifice to Mars offered by the Amazons, who had encamped on that spot. This court is said to have been established by Cecrops; and the number of the judges seems to have varied from nine to fifty. They were all men of the purest and strictest morality, and took cognizance of blasphemy against the gods, and of murder; whence they sat in the open air. They heard causes and passed sentence in the night; and no oratory was allowed to the pleaders, that the Areopagites might not receive a bias either through their eyes or ears. After the time of Pericles, however, B.C. 430, this court degenerated in respect of the morals of the judges; but its authority was long maintained. Robinson's *Archæologia*, and Parkhurst.

Hither St. Paul was dragged by the Epicureans and Stoics of Athens, as a *setter forth of strange gods*, Acts xvii. 18, 19; and here he boldly attacked the superstition and idolatry of the Athenians (ver. 23), and converted to the faith of the invisible and spiritual God, Dionysius, one of the judges, ver. 34.

55. *Τελῶναι and ἀρχιτελῶναι converted to Christianity; of what nation were the τελῶναι?*

See Art. 15. Matthew, who was converted at the receipt of custom (or table, or booth, which we should call the custom-house) at Capernaum (Luke v. 27), was a *τελώνης*; an inferior publican; and Zacchæus an *ἀρχιτελώνης*, or chief publican, Luke xix. 2. If the parable of the pharisee and publican was a real story, by the standing afar off of the latter may be signified his being in the outer court as a Gentile; but if so, he was a convert, because *justified*; which he could only be through faith in Christ.

The *ἀρχιτελῶναι* were usually Romans of the equestrian order, though Zacchæus was a Jew, or *son of Abraham*, Luke xix. 9. The *τελῶναι* appear to have been Jews, Matt. ix. 9, x. 3. According to Josephus, their dignity was Roman, but their descent Jewish, *De Bell.* lib. 2; and Cicero says, “*Omnes publicanos totum fere equestrem ordinem.*” Thus, when Jews, they may have been dignified, in order to palliate their obloquy and abate their unpopularity. It may be observed, that the classical writers quoted by Parkhurst (art. *τελώνης*) speak only of *publicans* generally; and we affirm that *ἀρχιτελώνης*, applied to Zacchæus, when rendered *a chief man among the publicans*, is an imperfect translation: as though we should say, Burnet or Butler was a chief man among the bishops, not an archbishop. See Wetstein on Matt. v.

56. *Publicans and sinners: why joined.*

Men revile those whom they hate. Tax-gatherers are not usually much liked, especially when employed by a conquering power; or when, having farmed the taxes, they repay themselves by exaction or extortion, as they often did in Judea, Luke iii. 12, 13. The *Herodians* refused to pay money to strangers: others, like the Gaulonites, said they had no king but God, and doubted the legality of paying tribute to Cæsar. By these the obnoxious publicans must have been classed and coupled with sinners (Matt. v. 46, 47), and held in dislike as heathens, Matt. xviii. 17.

57. *Christ the wisdom of God.*

Christ's increasing in wisdom is to be understood of his human intelligence, which was capable of growth to maturity, like his stature; and it is a foolish objection of the Socinians, that if he were God, his wisdom would be incapable of increase. Wisdom is put for Christ in Prov. iii. 19; but as he is there mentioned as the Maker of the heavens and earth, the passage refers to his Divine nature. He is called *the wisdom of God*, 1 Cor. i. 24; and said to be *to us wisdom*, 1 Cor. i. 30. But we are to consider the quality in our Lord while on earth as *οὐνεως, intelligence*, Luke ii. 47.

Here, then, is a man, from his earliest years discussing points of religion with the doctors of the law—astonishing them with his understanding and *answers* (or rather *speeches*, ἀποκρίσεις)—confounding, by his conduct and discourse, the wisdom of the wise—explaining prophecy—expounding Scripture—carrying all his points without force—introducing a system into the world exactly suited to the moral necessities of mankind, a system of pardon and purification, as a remedy for their spiritual diseases of guilt and frailty; an illumination of their ignorance, a clearing up of their doubts, a guide to their steps; and, in proportion to its extension and reception, a blessing to them in this world and in the next—a system which breathes purity, and peace, and good-will, the admiration even of infidels and profligates, the stay of the faithful, the consolation of the afflicted, and the hope of the dying. When we see him promulgating this wise system by the wisest means, not flattering wealth or power, but laying the axe to the root of the tree, preaching to the poor, going about doing good, choosing humble but honest coadjutors, addressing himself to the world, not in a laboured treatise like the Greek philosophers, but in parables and short sayings, interesting and easy to be understood,—the question is a natural one; *Whence hath this man this wisdom?* Matt. xiii. 54. And when we find that this extraordinary individual is a Jew, brought up in Jewish prejudices and national exclusiveness, of low birth and narrow education, born in an obscure village, working, up to his thir-

tieth year, at the trade of a mean mechanic—when we ask, *Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? are not his brethren and sisters ordinary peasants? whence, then, hath this man all these things?*—far from coming to the conclusion of his town's-fellows—that of being offended in him (because *a prophet hath no honour in his own country*)—we shall rather say with the centurion (setting his miracles out of the question, and simply comparing his birth, education, and opportunities, with the astonishing plan, extensive design, blissful tendency, and actual diffusion of his Gospel),—*Truly this was the Son of God.*

58. *Christ and Mahomet.*

An impostor, designing to introduce a new religion by means merely human, would calculate the probabilities of success, and consider how far he possessed the secrets of worldly ambition. Let us try Mahomet and Jesus by this test. Mahomet knew himself to be a man of superior birth, honourable rank, powerful family, and large acquired fortune. Jesus was destitute of all the advantages of birth, rank, wealth, or influential connexions. An impostor possessing these advantages would be less solicitous about his personal morals, than studious to gain proselytes by a latitude of indulgence. Mahomet, himself licentious and impetuous, made the virtues pleasing to Heaven those of warfare and violence, called the sword the key of heaven and hell, and promised a *sensual* paradise. Christ, meek and spotless, inculcated purity even of thought and the hidden man of the heart; came not to destroy men's lives, but to spare them; left a legacy of peace; and offered to his followers self-denial, afflictions, and persecutions, upon earth, to be recompensed by a *spiritual* eternity.

An impostor would strengthen his cause by feigning preternatural sanctions. Mahomet pretended communications with heaven; but never proved them. Christ was twice declared, by heavenly voices, to be the Son of God: he fulfilled the prophecies; and was himself a prophet of events which happened. Mahomet hardly pretended miracles: Christ wrought them publicly.

An impostor not possessing miraculous assistance, would seek to advance his religion by compulsion. Mahomet headed armies, and proposed to the nations, "Death or belief—the Koran or the sword." Christ went about doing good; appealed to the prophets, and said to his countrymen, *Believe me for my works' sake.* Of Mahomet may be said —

Not wrought one wonder in the noon of day,
Nor blazed in crowds, or witnessed in the way :
And sped not power the impostor's headlong course ?
His converts slaves, weak proselytes of force.
Not such, fair Truth, thine empire's mild increase ;
Thy sword persuasion, and thy mandate peace.

GRANT'S *Arabia.*

Never was there a more striking contrast than between the doctrines and morals of the Koran and the doctrines and morals of the Gospel. As on all hands it is acknowledged that Mahomet bore every mark of an impostor, we conclude that Christ, being the antithesis of Mahomet in every point, was the reverse of an impostor—that is, a messenger from heaven, bringing a Gospel which is truth. See White's *Bampton Lect.* and Porteous's *Evidences.*

59. *Alleged silence of the New Testament on the subject of infant baptism.*

The analogy of circumcision, which was the initiatory rite into the privileges of the *Jewish* church, would be applicable to baptism, the constituted mode of entrance into the privileges of the *Christian* church. When infants die, a previous baptism gives the security (not of our reasoning upon their having committed no actual sin, which might be opposed by their having done no actual good, but of the promise of God's word) for their salvation.

There is no passage excluding infants from baptism ; but it is said, *He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved.* In the case of infants, then, whose reason is unripe, the baptism is administered ; the belief is pre-supposed ; and the soul is thus placed in the covenant of grace.

60. *The Lord's Prayer, literal translation, and the Hebraisms.*

Thus, therefore, pray ye: *Our Father who [art] in the heavens; may thy name be held holy; may thy kingdom come; may thy will be done, as in heaven, so on the earth; give us this day the bread of our substance (panem substantialem); and remit to us our debts, as we absolve our debtors; and bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one, &c.* The first Hebraism consists in ὄνομα, putting the name for the person: other Hebraisms are, "bread" put for food and necessities; "debts" for trespasses; and "the evil one" for evil.

Some consider "name" to be the Word, the second Person of the Trinity; and take in this sense, *Father, glorify thy name*, in John xii. 28, as corresponding to the שֵׁם יְהוָה and שֵׁם אֱלֹהִים of Deut. xii. 11, Ps. xx. 1, lxxv. 2, Isa. xxx. 7.

61. *Water of separation.*

The water of separation was appointed for the cleansing of those who had touched a dead body; and the account of it is found in Numbers, ch. xix. In Brown's *Antiquities*, vol. i. p. 412, the accumulation of rites grafted on this by the later Jews is related from the Mishna. A red heifer was burnt to ashes, with much ceremony; after which the priest, and any other who officiated, washed their bodies and their garments. A legally clean person then gathered up the ashes, and laid them up without the camp, for waters of separation, as a purification for sin. The ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean are mentioned in the Hebrews as of far inferior power to the blood of Christ, Heb. ix. 13, 14. The red heifer was chosen in opposition to the Egyptians, who offered cows of that colour to Typhon, Python, or the evil power—one of the refutations of those rationalists who pretend that Moses borrowed his institutions from Egypt.

62. *Atonement: its reasonableness.*

It is agreeable to reason, that an infinitely pure God shall have a decided aversion from sin, and that a just God should punish it in probationary and free agents; nor is it otherwise

than reasonable that he should proclaim his intention to do so. If sin, then, has been committed, it is reasonable (after such proclamation) that he should abide by the pledge of his veracity and the character of his justice and holiness, and not forgive without some satisfaction—not display mercy so easily as to stultify his own laws, and destroy the balance of his attributes. If neither man nor angel, then, could provide the adequate satisfaction, it is reasonable that God (this is the real exercise of his mercy) should himself provide it. It is, however, quite reasonable that this provision should be suspended on the conditions of faith and repentance; for though we cannot do all, we must do what we can; and for this end, too, our evil nature has a reasonable help in the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit.

It does not accord with reason, that a *brief life* (even supposing it perfect in morals) should claim an *eternity of happiness*; much less that our blotted virtue and frail penitence should deserve any reward of God. It is, then, a matter of grace; and the free giver has a right to choose his own channel of bestowing it. “The penitent,” says Adam Smith (quoted by Magee, vol. i. p. 200), “distrusts the efficacy of his own repentance. Some other atonement must be made for him, he thinks, before the purity of the Divine justice can be reconciled to his manifest offences. The higher the satisfying victim, the more complete is the assurance of its efficacy—most complete when the victim is Divine, and one with the Giver. Thus, too, obedience is rendered a service of gratitude and love.” [This passage was expunged from later editions, when Smith became tainted with scepticism.]

But is it reasonable that the *just should suffer for the unjust*? We would not pry into mysteries, but we would ask,—How much of our happiness is procured for us by others, at the expense of much privation and pain to themselves? If the parent rocks the sickly child on her knee, and the master instructs, and the physician heals, and the friend flies to our assistance,—is it unreasonable to receive eternal life, under the conditions above mentioned, through the suffering and intercession of an innocent Redeemer, influenced by the kindest love towards

his creatures when unable to help themselves? See Magee, vol. i.; Craven, p. 288; Butler's *Analogy*; Conybeare's *Lectures*.

The son of Zaleucus, king of the Locrians, having committed an offence to which the law awarded the loss of his eyes, Zaleucus submitted to the loss of one of his own, while his son also lost one; so that the people might venerate the majesty of the laws, and yet mercy ally itself to justice. This story has been used to reconcile cavillers to the Christian scheme of atonement; but, though a good and ingenious help to comprehension, it is very incomplete.

63. *Evidence of prophetic inspiration.*

The only *certain* evidence of the inspiration of a prophet, is his power of working miracles; for we cannot think that God would endow him with such power to the end that he might more successfully propagate as truth the coinage of his own brain. Moses and Elijah thus supported their claims to speaking as from God; and our Lord himself said, *Though ye believe not my words* [themselves], *believe the works I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me*, John x. 25, 37, 38, v. 36, xiv. 10, 11.

The evidence of such miracles is to be established by the unequivocal testimony of honest and impartial witnesses; especially when there is no room for suspecting a juggle; when the relators could not be deceived; when they had no inducement to deceive; and when they encountered death sooner than depart from their narrative.

A prophet is likewise to be relied on as inspired, if his previous prophecies (not being the mere predictions of sagacity, or guess-work) have been fulfilled. He is, again, to be received (though by an inferior test) before the accomplishment of his predictions, when his conduct manifests full confidence in his own prophecy; as when Noah spent many years in preparing his ark; or when Jeremiah bought the field of Anathoth before the Babylonish captivity, in confidence of its being again cultivated. But in this case he must be a man of venerable character, and a preacher of righteousness; and his prophecy must harmonise with other acknowledged prophecies, or, at any rate, not

contradict them. Unless where miracles are wrought, however, the belief in the inspiration of the prophet cannot be full, till the event shall set on it the seal of Heaven. Yet the fulfilment of a near and intermediate prophecy gives ground of waiting with assurance for the greater and more remote event foretold; and this seems the secret of the secondary interpretation of prophecies, to prop staggering faith in expecting the far-distant and chief fulfilment.

We should believe, however, in the inspiration of the Apocalypse, even though St. John had worked no miracle, since we could not conceive it possible that our Lord would suffer the disciple whom he loved to give the sanction of his name to a falsehood or a delusion. Prophecy is a running comment on the providence of God, as are its minute peculiarities on his particular providence.

64. *Natural and revealed religion: the fundamental doctrines of both equally mysterious and inexplicable.*

Natural religion is that knowledge and veneration of God, and acquaintance with the principles of those duties arising from our relation to him, which are either impressed on our minds by nature, or discovered by a right use of our reasoning faculties. *Revealed* religion is that knowledge of God, and of our duties and destinies, which he has communicated in direct intercourse with some of his creatures, or in the holy Scriptures. Many persons doubt whether there is or can be such a thing as natural religion; and whether that which we call natural religion may not have been revealed.* They think that God im-

* The preceding remarks may in many parts be illustrated by an extract from Dryden's preface to his *Religio Laici*.

"Truly I am apt to think that the revealed religion, which was taught by Noah to all his sons, might continue for some ages in the whole posterity. That afterwards it was inculcated wholly in the family of Shem, is manifest. But when the progenies of Ham and Japhet swarmed into colonies, and those colonies were subdivided into many others, in process of time their descendants lost, by little and little, the primitive and purer rites of divine worship, retaining only the notion of one Deity, to which succeeding generations added others, for men took their degrees in those days from conquerors to gods. Revelation being thus eclipsed to all mankind, the light of nature, as the next in dignity,

parted the great truths of religion and duty to the progenitors of the human race ; and that these, disfigured more or less by the corruptions and idolatries of subsequent generations, as they removed from the first settlements, and forgot their early instructions, constitute the basis of what we now dignify with the name of natural religion ; and they refer to the ignorance, barbarism, cruelty, and profligacy of nations among whom all traces of natural religion have vanished. But let us grant, in due extent, that the invisible things of God from the creation of the world may be, and are clearly seen [or inferred], being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead (*godship*, *θεϊότης*), Rom. i. 20 ; and that the Gentiles, which have not the law (the only revealed law), may do, and actually do, by nature, the things contained in the law, and become a law unto themselves, their consciences and thoughts accusing or excusing (Rom. ii. 14, 15) ; yet, left to themselves, with so bare an outline, so meagre a shadow of religious knowledge, as that there is a great designing Power, and that, in some way or other, it is wrong to oppose his moral government ; after

was substituted ; and that is it which St. Paul concludes to be the rule of the heathens, and by which they are hereafter to be judged. If my supposition be true, then the consequence I have assumed in my poem may be also true, viz. that deism, or the principles of natural worship, are only the faint remnants or dying flames of revealed religion in the posterity of Noah ; and that our modern philosophers, nay, and some of our philosophising divines, have too much exalted the faculties of our souls, when they have maintained that by their force mankind has been able to find out that there is one supreme agent or intellectual being which we call God, that praise and prayer are his true worship, and the rest of those deducements which, I am confident, are the remote effects of revelation. So that we have not lifted up ourselves to God by the weak pinions of our reason : he has been pleased to descend to us ; and what Socrates said of him, what Plato writ, and the rest of the heathen philosophers of several nations, is all no more than the twilight of revelation, after the sun of it was set in the race of Noah."

Nothing has been yet said respecting the way in which a sinful being shall obtain pardon—a frail being help in obedience—a blind creature knowledge of Divine truths—an afflicted creature solid consolation—a dying being hope of immortality. All these are difficulties in the way of natural theology. As to prayer, it is scoffed at as an insult to his omniscience, by informing him of what he knows ; and to his goodness, by asking what, if he be good, he would give without our asking.

all, how little that is really essential can they know, and how great and manifold must be their difficulties !

I. Who, or what, or where, is this God ? What is his nature ? Is he a personal being ? Is he the soul of the world ? If so, how is the body of the world, the insensible, material part of this universal frame, to be accounted for ? Will it be said that God created matter ? Natural religion answers, *Ex nihilo nihil fit*. Will it be said that matter exists eternally, and independently of God ? Then God is not omnipotent ; his attributes are limited by some co-eternal power. Or, once more, is it urged that matter is part of God ? that the universe is God—a vast living all, whose body nature is, and MIND its soul ?

Jupiter est quodcunque vides, quocunque moveris.—LUCRET.

Or, in the language of another poet, that God is no more than the Spirit who

Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glows in the stars, and blossoms in the trees.

If thus sun, stars, breeze, and trees, are all important parts of Deity, it must follow that every thing is God—that the most wicked wretch on earth is part of God : and what becomes of conscience ? or where is my accountability ? or the difference between a saint and a sinner ?

The personality of God compared with his omnipresence, and the triune nature of God, are difficulties in *revealed* religion ; but they are only difficulties arising from our present want of comprehension.

II. The next difficulty in natural religion relates to the *origin of evil*. If God be perfect goodness, can evil emanate from him ? Why did he permit it to exist ? Shall we become disciples of Zerdusht, and say there are two co-equal powers, one good and one evil, from all eternity contending against each other ? Such is the puzzle of natural theology. Here *revealed* religion has no difficulty : I CREATE EVIL, *saith the Lord* ; and it is created as a trial for his rational probationary creatures, that they may rise to a more exalted state in his universe, by a struggle in which their better, and by him invigorated energies shall conquer.

III. Another difficulty of natural religion relates to particular providence. It can be seen that the universe is governed by wise and uniform laws: the fixed stars are immovable from age to age; the planets roll and return, one after another; one generation hath produced its kind, by a mysterious adaptation of the male to the female, throughout all the ranks of organised beings: and even inanimate matter is subservient to the purposes of life; vegetables and animals have a wonderful conformity in organisation and nutriment, and are nicely adapted and proportioned to each other. But do not all things seem to proceed by great laws laid down, from which there is not a possibility of swerving? Does not the Maker and Lawgiver seem as if he left the things thus generally arranged to take their own course? Why are so many animals formed to be the food of others, and all of them that of man, in preparation for whose meals they undergo much fear and pain? Whence comes the tempest, the plague, the conflagration, which sweeps masses of people away, without regard to their individual vice or virtue? Does not every thing appear as if God, in his general providence, had as much of terror and cruelty as of mildness and beneficence? and as if, in regard to particular providence, he preserved the species, and neglected the individual?

Revealed religion is here satisfied with the information, that not a sparrow shall fall to the ground without the knowledge, permission, and order of God; and that every man shall give an account of *himself* to God. And when reason is considered as the handmaid of revealed religion, it sees that nothing can happen in the universe without the cognisance of God; and that he would not be God, if he had not, even in the slightest matters, an omnipresent inspection, or if any secret were hidden from his omniscience.

IV. If difficulties hang upon revealed religion, in regard to the reconciliation of foreknowledge and free-will, they equally encumber natural religion. We know, we feel we are free and responsible agents; and yet an omniscient God—the Creator, and Preserver, and Governor of this universe, eternal and mysteriously great—is not throwing dice with chance or fate: he must know all things, past, present, and to come.

V. The last difficulty I shall mention in natural religion relates to the immortality of the soul. And here a previous question is to be disposed of, viz. *Has man a soul?* Is he any thing more than organised body, animated by the air or breath of life? a superior animal, whose advantages can be traced to the form, and substance, and development of his brain and nerves, the form of his hand, his power of speech, his talent of writing, and his consequent capability of transmitting his knowledge from sire to son, as the basis of progressive improvement?

Many of the arguments used by natural religion in favour of a future state—the shortness of life, the pains here endured, the indiscriminate visitations of evil, and present ignorance,—would be conclusive for the future life, consciousness, and individuality, not of man only, but likewise of every one of the ten millions of animals we destroy in drinking a glass of water. Indeed, Pope asked, “Where would be the harm if the animals had another conscious life?” And Wesley and others could only reconcile their suffering here for the sin of man, to the goodness of God, by allowing them a compensation in futurity. If we doubt this, on the score of their numbers and insignificance, let us ask—why were they created once?

But what are the farther doubts of natural religion?

1. I had no conscious existence before my birth; and analogy leads me to conclude that my consciousness will utterly cease at the separation of my breath and body.

2. The body is all by which I know the man, and *that* at death is buried in the grave, soon to be blended with the dust. How can I know that the *living principle* may not be the breath which is absorbed in the ocean of the atmosphere, and thus lost for ever.

3. All men die—that is clear; but no man—to *natural religion*—has ever returned.

4. The brutes perish utterly; and why should not man?

5. When persons are recovered from drowning, or from swoons, they bring no secrets from the other world along with them. Their breath of life has been drawn back just in time; a few moments longer, and they would have been annihilated. Had the soul no glimpse of its new being? Is not its entire

oblivion in the swoon an intimation that all is darkness, and that there are no secrets to communicate?

6. Could not all the functions of what we call the soul be accounted for on materialist principles, a finer organisation only being given?

These are all difficulties of natural religion. Revealed religion is delivered from them all in the words, — *Fear not them which kill the body, but him who can destroy both the body AND the soul*, Matt. x. 28; *Christ the first fruits of the grave, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming.*

The only difficulty in revealed religion is that of believing in the *authenticity* of those records wherein its truths are announced. Now, the probability that God would reveal his will to a being thus blind and ignorant—the antiquity and preservation of the sacred writings—their consistence in one plan throughout so many ages—their indirect support derived from collateral history, language, customs—one part of them being in the custody of enemies to the other, which yet fulfils and tallies with the former—the internal purity of their morals and tendency—and the adaptation of the great doctrines to the wants of men, do altogether make up a body of irrefragable evidence in favour of the truth of revelation.

65. Προσήλυτος, *proselytes of the temple, and proselytes of the gate.*

Προσήλυτος is derived from πρὸς and the obsolete verb ἐλεύθω, and literally signifies “a person coming from one religion to another.” Under the Old Testament dispensation a stranger was so called who came to dwell among the Jews, and embraced their religion by submitting to the rite of circumcision, with all the males of his house, Exod. xii. 48, 49, Levit. xvii. 10, Num. ix. 14. He was then admitted to the passover, and, following all the Mosaic ordinances, was called a *proselyte of the temple*, or of justice. Women became proselytes by baptism and sacrifice. The Hebrew words גֵּר and גֵּרָא are used in the same sense.

The *proselytes of the gate*, or of habitation, are those who, without submitting to circumcision, or obliging themselves to the legal ceremonies, worshipped the one true God, and bound

themselves to keep the seven Noachic precepts, concerning justice, obedience, idolatry, profaneness, sacrifice, theft, and modesty. Swearing before three witnesses to observe these rules, they enjoyed the prosperity of the people of God, and were in the path of eternal life. Naaman, Cornelius, and the Ethiopian eunuch, were proselytes of the gate, and had access to the court of the Gentiles. The proselytes of the temple could enter the court of the Israelites.

In the New Testament every convert from heathenism to Judaism, wherever he dwelt, received the name of proselyte; and the Pharisees were said to compass heaven and earth to make one, Matt. xxiii. 15. Nicholas was a proselyte of Antioch, Acts vi. 5.

66. *Miracles, why not of frequent occurrence.*

It is the nature and definition of a miracle to be something out of the ordinary course of nature, and not explicable by known laws. If such wonders were of frequent occurrence, they would cease to be wonders. Scepticism would ascribe them to latent, or yet undiscovered natural causes—perhaps to a juggle, or confederacy. Except to the original eye-witnesses, the evidence of miracles depends upon testimony; and unless all men had ocular demonstration, their repetition would add no conviction to the minds of any who might be excluded from that privilege. A, B, and C might be gratified with a miracle; but unless all the letters down to Z saw it, to them it would still be testimony. Again, that one grain of corn should produce sixty or a hundred, is as much a miracle as feeding five thousand men with five barley loaves. Reason cannot account for the effect; but as the sequence is constant and invariable, we call it the course of nature. A constant or frequent sequence in the other case would soon acquire the same name.

If we allow God to be the author of the course of nature, we must admit that the course of nature is planned by infinite wisdom; and though it may seem good to God to shew his power over the course of nature by varying it on some great occasion, in order to give the sanction of truth to the words of any messenger he may commission to instruct or warn mankind,

yet to repeat these deviations frequently would be to depart from the plans and course of infinite wisdom, and would come, in the end, to shake belief in that wisdom.

In the first instance, the all-wise plan of good is waved for the sake of greater good ; in the latter, it would be sacrificed to the desires of an unreasonable scepticism. Neither is it certain, that if frequent miracles produced *conviction*, they would, in a self-deceiving heart, produce conversion : *for if they hear not Moses and the prophets* (it may be said of sceptics), *neither would they be persuaded* [to repent] *though one rose from the dead.*

Miracles of frequent occurrence would, under a different view, overwhelm the minds of men, and force conviction, instead of acting on the judgment : and being suited to beings whose *belief* is probationary as well as their conduct, they would destroy the nature of *faith*, which is *the evidence of things not seen*, Heb. xi. 1.

67. *A future state proved by the nature and capacity of the soul.*

The soul, even in its fallen state, is of a nature which shews it to be born for immortality ; it is endued with power and aspirations which scorn the narrow toils, and aim beyond the limited time of this brief life, and the contracted space of the globe it treads ; it feels as it were the budding of its wings, and longs to expatiate among the bright worlds it sees at a distance, and to know more of the works of the Creator ; it has conceptions of pure bliss which present things cannot satisfy, and which would be useless and inexplicable on the supposition of its being annihilated,—drawing off its attention from the only reality it should ever enjoy, and converting a God of wisdom into a God of cruelty.

Besides the nature, the *capacities* of the soul indicate its being formed for immortality. Throughout the inferior creation the Almighty seems to have adapted the *capacities* of animals to the enjoyments and occupations for which they are designed. As they do not seem to be destined for a future life, they are furnished with no conception of it, being left to the contented

enjoyment of their proper accommodations; and further, beyond a certain pitch of growth, they are incapable of improving their nature, even here, progressively. Every brute creature, like every herb, soon attains its zenith of perfection, and then passes away. What an ox, a dog, a nightingale, were at the creation, they are now, and they are no more,—an insuperable barrier stops their progress. Man has not only a strong desire for infinite advancement—a feeling in his nature that he is born for another scene, but a peculiar power of endless progression in knowledge, and purification in holiness, continually verging but never attaining to the throne of God.

Why did the Creator distinguish, and, we may say, mock his reasonable creatures with these views, and these expanded capabilities, if the whole were to terminate in an illusion? Why dissatisfy them with their present condition, by setting the notion and expectation of a brighter future before them, which should be a shadow, a dream? Why make a vessel of boundless dimensions to pour into it a few drops? or plant a palm-tree with properties of lofty growth, to stunt its early shoots, and crush it as it rises to the heavens? The germ of illimitable knowledge—the ability of multifarious acquirement, far exceeding the longest and best-improved extension of human life—the expectations, and the conscious powers of exploring secrets yet unknown, and of discerning the lofty and unimagined things of immensity, cannot at all comport with our ideas of a being born but to toil round the mean and narrow mill-wheel of a short and evil term of labour, enjoying a few scanty irradiations of imperfect information, and then doomed to sink at once from unworthy drudgery into more unworthy oblivion; from partial knowledge into utter and endless darkness; from the thirst of inquisitiveness into the gulf of annihilation. It is not possible to conceive that a discursive faculty, capable of traversing the firmament, should have no ulterior destiny beyond that of ministering to the low wants, and aiding the mean occupations of its bodily associate, or be circumscribed within the narrow compass and guess-work of threescore years and ten—the confinement in a jar, compared with its panting elasticity.

But, in addition to all this, the soul has moral instincts, which point, both in hope and fear, to hereafter. Of these the lower animals know nothing. We are sensible of an inward check before the commission of sin, which is a lash of scorpions after it: nor are we less sensible that virtue has reason to look forward to a more equitable allotment of recompense than it here receives. What are these accusings and self-approbations, but a fearful looking-for of judgment, and a prophesying that verily there is a reward for the righteous—natural indications, in short, of a future state? Though we speak humbly of merit, and think our evils deserved, there is no proportion here between moral good or evil, and reward or punishment, as they regard different individuals. The last act of the drama is clearly yet to come.

68. *Infant baptism.*

Go ye and baptise all nations, Matt. xxviii. 19; but nations consist of young children as well as adults. The household of Lydia, of the jailor in Philippi, and of Stephanas, were all baptised at once; and it is not to be supposed that they did not contain children. In a former article we have shewn that circumcision, the corresponding rite in the Jewish church, was practised on the eighth day after birth. *God will have all men to be saved* (1 Tim. ii. 4), and baptism is the entrance to salvation; for, *except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven*, John iii. 3. Our Lord himself said, *Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven*; and if for a blessing, why not for a baptism, which is the means and emblem of a blessing? But if adult were substituted for infant baptism, should we say that all persons dying before their fourteenth year are lost? How then would be explained, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy*; or, Acts ii. 39, *For the promise is to you and to your children*?

The Anti-pædobaptists urge the text, *Go and teach all nations, baptising them*, Matt. xxviii. 19, as a reason for saying that all persons should be taught before they are baptised: but as in the original the words stand, *Go and make disciples* or

Christians *of all nations, baptising them, &c.*, as is evident from the following verse, *baptising and teaching*,—the teaching before and the teaching after the rite would be tautologous. In adults the teaching is included in the making of disciples; in infants it may scripturally follow.

Baptism is called, in Coloss. ii. 11, the circumcision without hands, and the circumcision of Christ; and so must be co-extensive with that rite. Infants had been baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, 1 Cor. x. If an express command were necessary to order infant baptism, why is the other sacrament administered to women, or the Sabbath advanced to the first day? If the kingdom of heaven consists of little children, they must (in a Christian land, where baptism is within reach) be baptised; since without baptism by water, none can enter there. Infant baptism was never questioned for 1500 years; and all the early Fathers speak of it. Infant baptism binds the infant to keep the terms of a covenant; and he either must keep them, or lose the privileges of the covenant—that is his alternative. Baptism always accompanied circumcision in the Jewish church in regard to a proselyte with his infants; and it is not prohibited in regard to infants by Christ. But can an infant be a disciple? He can receive the Holy Ghost, and be regenerated (a term used by the Fathers as synonymous with baptism): John the Baptist was full of the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb. *Repent, and be baptised; for the promise is to you and to your children*, Acts ii. 39. Shall an infant have its angel always beholding the face of God, and shall we refuse it a place in the church on earth?

69. *The holy of holies, the sanctuary, the court of the temple.*

The court of the temple was the sacred area before the building, subdivided into the court of the Gentiles, the court of the Israelites, and the court of the priests; in which last stood the altar of burnt-offering, and the brazen laver.

The sanctuary, or holy place, was the building itself; which, after passing its porch, was seen subdivided into the holy and the holy of holies. In the outer, or holy place, stood the golden

candlestick, the table of shew-bread, and the altar of incense, approached daily by the priests in their courses. It was separated by a great veil from the inner apartment, which held the ark of the covenant, covered with the wings of angels, as the mercy-seat, and contained, in the first temple, the two tables of stone, a pot of manna, and Aaron's rod that budded. Into this latter chamber the high priest only was permitted to enter; and that but once a-year—on the great day of expiation. See Heb. ix. 1-9, Exod. xxv. 26, 27, &c. The temple was formed on the model of the tabernacle.

70. In proselytism, did the Jews make any difference between children born before, and those born after the baptism of their parents?

When the Jews received a proselyte to their religion, they both circumcised and baptised him. They considered this baptism as a kind of regeneration, whereby he became a new man. His male children, however, were commanded to be circumcised as well as himself; agreeably to Exodus xii. 48, *When a stranger will sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover unto the Lord, let all his males be circumcised; and he shall be as one that is born in the land.* But as this baptism was conceived to be a cleansing from the pollutions of idolatry, it was not required of his children subsequently born; for it was a maxim with the rabbis, “*Natus baptizati habetur pro baptizato*” (Godwin and Jennings); the branches were esteemed holy, as springing from a holy root.

71. The Pharisees.

The Pharisees derive their name from פְּרִישִׁי *divisit*, Mic. iii. 3, Lament. xliv.; for they separated themselves from others, as pretending to greater sanctity. They are, in Acts xxvi. 5, styled by St. Paul, “the straitest sect” of the Jewish religion; and by Josephus accounted εὐσεβέστερον εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων. They plumed themselves on their skill in interpreting the law; to which they added many unwritten traditions, which they said were an oral law, delivered by God to Moses on the mount.

It is not certain at what period this sect arose; but its origin was probably subsequent to the time of Malachi, the last of the prophets, B.C. 397. The words of Isaiah (lxv. 5), *Stand by thyself, come not near me; for I am holier than thou*, though justly applied to them, only shew that there were proud hypocrites before they existed as a sect. The Pharisees acknowledged the immortality of the soul, and the existence of angels and spirits, Acts xxiii. 8; in this matter being opposed to the Sadducees, who denied both. But such of them as had been taught in the school of Alexandria believed in a transmigration of the souls of good men into other bodies; as, that Christ was John the Baptist, or Elias, or one of the prophets, Matt. xvi. 14; while the wicked were kept in chains of darkness for ever. They held the resurrection of the dead, with all its consequences, against the Sadducees, Matt. xxii. 23, Acts xxiii. 8. They strained some observances, good in themselves, to an unreasonable pitch; as, thinking it unlawful to heal and do good, or to take up one's couch or mattress, on the Sabbath-day; and added, as *traditions*, an intolerable yoke of their own inventions. Our Saviour, however, did not discountenance all traditions, but referred to some, as washings, saying that the evil consisted in substituting them, with the duties of almsgiving, fasting, and paying tithes, in the stead of the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith, Matt. xxiii. 23. *These*, said he, *you ought to have done, and not to leave the other observances undone.*

The Pharisees, in short, made long prayers for a show, and coveted salutations in the markets, while they vitiated even their prayers, and what good they did, by the *motive*, which was, *to be seen of men*; making broad their phylacteries — Hebrew תפלין or rolls of parchment inscribed with Scriptural texts, on the authority of Prov. iii. 1, 3, vi. 21, Deut. vi. 8, and worn on their wrists and foreheads; and, under this veil of pride and ostentation, devouring the houses of widows. All their religion was show; like a platter, of which the outside was burnished, and the inside neglected; and they themselves were as whited sepulchres, beautiful in aspect, but within full of uncleanness, Matt. xxiii.

The traditions were collected and published, 150 years before Christ, by Rabbi Judah Hakkodesh, who called his book the Mishna, or Second Law.

Nicodemus and St. Paul were Pharisees. While the Sadducees denied all future being, the Essenes affirmed the future life of the soul without any body; and the Pharisees stood between both. On the authority of Deut. xxii. 12, the modern Jews wear veils, having four strings and tassels, each string having *five* knots, to signify the five books of Moses; each string has *eight threads*, which, added to five and to the numeral value of the letters in מציץ, make 613, the number of precepts in the law: for,

	5 knots	5
	8 threads	8
מציץ is {	ז	90
	י	10
	צ	90
	י	10
	ח	400
							<hr/> 613

See Godwin's *Moses and Aaron*; Jennings' *Jewish Antiquities*; Allen's *Modern Judaism*; Cruden, art. *Pharisee*. In doctrinal points, and in many observances, the great body of the modern Jews are ostensibly Pharisees; and Sadduceeism is only the private belief of the licentious. Maimonides (1181) and Mendelsohn (1729) have done much to encourage the principles of the latter sect: they are the Jewish rationalists.

72. The Trinity.

The Trinity is the unity of three Persons in one Godhead, viz. the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Here we must neither confound the Persons, nor divide the substance or essence. We must not confound the Persons, by saying the Son and Holy Ghost are only influences of the Father, or different modes of his operating; which is the error of the Sabellians. The Son is a distinct Person, for he prays to the Father, and goes to the Father (John xvii., xvi. 28); and the Holy Ghost is a distinct person, for he is the Comforter whom the Son sends from the Father. Neither may we divide the substance,

by saying they are three Gods; for, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord*, Deut. vi. 4; or by saying there is one God with two inferior beings, as the Arians affirm. The Son is God; for he declares, *I and the Father are one*, John x. 30. The Holy Ghost is God; for Peter tells Ananias and Sapphira, that they had lied to the Holy Ghost, or to God, Acts v. 3, 4.

Admit the Divinity of the Second Person, and at his baptism the Third Person hovered over him, and the voice of the First Person said, *This is my beloved Son*, Matt. iii. 16, 17.

73. Reasoning à priori and à posteriori exemplified in the proofs of the existence of God.

Reasoning *à priori* proves the effect by its necessary cause; reasoning *à posteriori* proves the cause by its necessary effect. A robbery is committed, and a man taken up on suspicion; his notoriously bad character is a presumption *à priori* against him; at the trial a long chain of evidence brings the charge home, and this is *à posteriori* reasoning. The Pharisees accused Christ of working miracles by Beelzebub: he replies, I work miracles through a good and not an evil cause, for I practise and promote good, and the prince of evil would not give me power to oppose himself: *à priori*, your charge must be false. Admit benevolence and omnipotence in God, and there is both the will and the power to suspend a law of nature for an important purpose; an *à priori* proof of the probability of miracles. But when we say, that the miracles were wrought in open day, at public feasts, and before numbers of watchful enemies; that they could not happen by any natural means or juggle; that they convinced multitudes; and that the fact of their occurrence was never denied; while, at the same time, he who wrought them could ask confidently, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" we reason *à posteriori*, that the miracles happened, and happened by the power of God. That the miracles happened, is called the *demonstratio τοῦ ὁρῆ*,—that they happened by the power of God, is the *demonstratio τοῦ διόρῆ*,—shewing not only the occurrence, but the cause of the occurrence.

In proving the existence of the Deity *à priori*, certain metaphysical propositions are assumed as axioms. Space and

time are certainties, and force on us the ideas of immensity and eternity; but as immensity and eternity are not substances, they are the attributes of a Being who is necessarily immense and eternal: "Non est æternitas et infinitas, sed æternus et infinitus; non est duratio et spatium, sed *durat* et *adest*. Durat semper et adest ubique; existendo semper et ubique, durationem et spatium constituit."—NEWTON'S *Principia*, Scholium generale; Clarke; D. Stewart.

The argument *à posteriori* rests on two premises: the one is, that every thing which begins to exist must have a cause; the other, that a combination of means, conspiring to a particular end, implies an intelligent cause.

The first branch of the argument is thus stated by Grotius: "It is clear, from the consent and confession of all, that certain things exist which began to be. These things were not themselves the cause of their being; for that which is not cannot act, nor could any thing be before its existence. It follows, that they have their origin from elsewhere; and this must be allowed not only respecting the things we see or have seen, but likewise respecting those things whence they derive their origin,—donec tandem ad aliquam causam perveniamus, quæ esse nunquam cœperit; quæque sit, ut loqui solemus, non contingenter, sed necessario. Hoc autem, qualecunque tandem sit, idipsum est quod *Numinis* aut *Dei* voce significatur."—*De Veritate Relig. Christ.* lib. i. § 2.

And his commentator Le Clerc adds: "There must be some first cause of the things which began to be, or none: if a first cause, it is God. If a first cause is denied, then there must have been no cause of the things which began to be; that is, they either existed of themselves, or were produced by and out of nothing; *quod est absurdum*."

Beattie states the argument in another form: "We exist, and infer that something must have always existed; for if ever there was a time when nothing existed, there must have been a time when something began to be; and that something must have come into being without a cause, since by the supposition there was nothing before it. But that a thing should begin to exist, and yet proceed from no cause, is both absurd and incon-

ceivable : therefore some being must have existed from eternity. This being must either have been dependent on something else, or independent on any thing else. But a succession of dependent beings, without a first independent link, is absurd ; and an eternal being who is dependent, is impossible. There must be a point from which the whole chain of dependence originated ; and that point must be prior in time to that whole chain of dependence, which would be impossible, if that chain were from eternity. There is, therefore, an eternal and independent Being, on whom all other beings depend — that is God.”—BEATTIE’S *Moral Science*, § i. p. 281.

But some atheists attribute all things to chance, and affirm an eternal succession of causes and effects, or rather of antecedents and consequences, — thus setting aside the argument *à priori* ; and therefore we use the stronger argument *à posteriori*, from the indications of design and the manifestations of order in the things that are and have been. Chance cannot be intelligent ; and what is not chance is design. The regularity and harmony of the heavenly bodies — the sun to rule the day, and the moon to illumine the night — the return of seasons — the uniformity, amidst variety, in the structure of all animals and plants — their uses for food, health, medicine, accommodation — the adaptation of one part of nature to another, — do all exhibit marks of an intelligent mind ; and on seeing a palace, we might as well sing with the poet,

I sing how casual horse-hair, casual lime,
Encounter’d casual bricks in airy climb !

as maintain that the universe was created and is preserved by chance.

Now, design implies an intelligent being, a being who designs ; and that being is God.

See the conference between Socrates and Aristodemus, quoted from the *Memorabilia*, in Dugald Stewart’s *Active and Moral Powers*, book iii. chap. 2, § 2.

74. *How would you answer the questions, (1) Where was the Protestant church before Luther? (2) Is not the Liturgy taken from the Mass-book? (3) Is not the church of England a Parliament-church?*

(1) Where was the Protestant church before Luther? With the apostles — with the early Fathers — with the Albigenses — with Wickliffe, Ziska, Huss, Jerome of Prague; in short, in the Bible.

We answer, as Wilks replied to the same question, Where was your face before it was washed? The Reformation was not a new fountain; it was a filter, which purified the streams from the mud and insalubrity they had contracted in their course, and restored them to the clearness and limpidity of the mountain-spring.

(2) Is not the liturgy taken from the mass-book? Some prayers in the mass-book are taken from the liturgies of the early Christians, before the religion of Jesus became corrupted. We do not alter for altering's sake. Even the Lord's Prayer, except in one petition, was taken from Jewish services, as Light-foot has proved. But wherever the mass-book supports the doctrines of popery, the liturgy is opposed to it. See Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*.

(3) Is the church of England a parliament-church? It is supported in things temporal by the state, for the sake of an equally and widely distributed Gospel-dispensation; but the state only interferes in temporal matters. It is a pure and primitive church, founded in the doctrine and discipline of the apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone. If it be allied to the state, or under the immediate protection of the civil government, it is because no well-regulated government ought to exist without taking some one form of religion, for the good of the people at large, under its care, while other forms are tolerated; and the English government selects the best. The king is its supreme head, because the Bible tells us to honour the king. The laws of its external government are founded in acts of parliament, and enforced by civil sanctions; for we are ordered to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's

sake. Agreeably to the twentieth Article, the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in matters of faith, over her own members; and parliament confirms, by civil authority, what had previously been enacted by ecclesiastical authority. But this defence and provision for the security and welfare of the church and of its ministers by human laws, no more lessen its internal beauty and value than laws for protecting property and ensuring safety diminish any man's wisdom, or impair his natural right to his property, or discredit the constitution under which he lives.

A portion for the support of the church is, by law, paid by the people at large; because the state has an equal right to assess them for their own general advantage as to assess them for a police-establishment, though many individuals may choose to have private watchmen. It is the duty of the state to look to the universal good; and it cannot look to rare exceptions, which might be here and not there, or here to-day and absent to-morrow.

The laws of parliament also may sanction the endowment of a church, or protect its endowment. Barnabas having land sold it, and brought the money and laid it at the apostles' feet. Had Barnabas given the land itself, there would have been no difference; and their acceptance of the land would have involved the whole principle of endowments.

The endowment, then, so made is by law protected, like any other property. Were church and state separated, what provision would be made for poor districts, or for *occasional* duties, visiting the sick, &c., among those who would preach to fill their chapels, and be less solicitous about the sick and poor?—flying preachers, like strolling players—a *compagnia volante*—moving and holding forth from station to station, but fixed and resident nowhere. Religion is unpalatable. Food men will *seek*, and competition will bring it to men's doors; but the means of grace, in order to be good, must be provided—not sold; yet not provided by popular election—for that would occasion endless dissensions. The French revolution shews what a government is without religion. God himself, in selecting his chosen people, allied his church with the state, and made himself the Lord of

the theocracy. A national religion is the outward sign of a covenant between God and a people, and a pledge of protection ; Levit. xxvi. 11, *I will set my tabernacle among you, and in all the glory there shall be a defence.* Our Saviour's words, *My kingdom is not of this world*, were an answer to Pilate's fears lest he should set up a temporal kingdom ; but he did not thereby supersede Isa. xlix. 23, *Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and queens thy nursing mothers.*

75. *Dialect of the New Testament.*

The New Testament is written in the Hellenistic Greek, which was the Attic dialect of Greece intermixed with other dialects, and learned — not grammatically — by the Jews who settled at Alexandria in the time of the Ptolemies. The Gospels, like the Septuagint, were written in this language or dialect, modified by the Hebrew, whose idioms were mixed with it. The Hellenistic language appears in several of the early Christian Fathers. See Moses Stuart's *Grammar of the New Test. Dialect*, Lond. ed. 1838. The Attic mixed with other dialects was called ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος.

76. *Canon of Scripture, and when authoritatively settled.*

The canon of the Old Testament was completed in the time of Simon the Just, after 1st and 2d Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Malachi, had been added to the collection made by Ezra on the return from the Babylonish captivity, — divided into twenty-two books, according to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet ; and referred to by our Saviour, Luke xxiv. 45. This, being the same as that given by Josephus, was universally allowed to be followed by the primitive church, until the Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, which took in some apocryphal books.

The books of the New Testament, as we now have them, were admitted, by general consent, in the early church, with the exception of James, Jude, 2d Peter, 2d and 3d John, and Hebrews, with the Revelations, which were not *universally*

received at first, but are now held to be canonical; being referred to and quoted by the early fathers.

The canonical books, cited by Christian writers up to the time of the apostles, and the catalogues furnished by Origen A.D. 210, Eusebius and Athanasius A.D. 315, and others of that date, agree with the list now received; but the general canon was first authoritatively sealed by the Council of Laodicea, in canon lx. A.D. 366.

The canons of this council were shortly after admitted into the general church at the second general council, that of Constantinople, A.D. 381. The list is the same as ours, only omitting the Apocalypse; of the genuineness and authenticity of which, however, there is full proof.

77. The councils of the Jews; their synagogues; the principal officers, and their respective functions.

The Sanhedrim (from *συνέδριον*, and this from *σύν* and *ἔδρα sedes*) was the *great council* of the Jews, and signifies a number of persons sitting together, Matt. x. 7, Mark xiii. 9, Acts vi. 15. It consisted of seventy, or seventy-two, elders of the people and priests, whence it is called by St. Luke (xxii. 66, and Acts xxii. 5) *τὸ πρεσβυτέριον* and (Acts v. 21) *γερονσίαν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ*. This council, which determined important matters of church and state, and received appeals from inferior courts, met in the hall *Gezith*, a rotunda half within and half without the Temple, in the latter portion of which the elders had their places, it being unlawful to sit in the Temple. The high-priest was president; but under him was a vice-president, the *נָּשִׁיךְ* (*nasi*) or prince of the sanhedrim, who sat on a throne at the end of the hall, nearest to the court of the Israelites, with the other senators on each side in a semicircle. The senators were required to be rich, mature in age, and without personal blemish.

The Talmudical writers date the rise of the sanhedrim from the Exodus, when Moses complaining of the weight of his charge, God commanded him to gather seventy elders, who might bear the burden of the people with him, Num. xi. 16, 17, Exod. xviii. 18. But Grotius and others are of opinion that the great council originated in Egypt, in memory of the seventy

persons who came down thither with Jacob; that it never ceased; and that vestiges of it are found in every part of the Jewish history, Deut. xvii. 8, &c., 2 Chron. xix. 8, Ezra vii. 25, 26, and many other passages. Parkhurst in art. *συνέδριον*, Fleury, Jennings, Horne, Browne's *Dictionary*, Selden *de Synedria*.

Other writers, however, maintain that the sanhedrim was a new institution, of date subsequent to the Babylonish captivity. This court could pass sentence of death, until Judea became subject to the Roman power.

In the secondary cities there was an inferior sanhedrim, or council of twenty-three judges; and these in Jerusalem sat in an apartment belonging to the Temple, close to the gate of Susa. There was also in the smaller towns an inferior court of three judges, who took cognisance of slight causes. It is with reference to the lesser and the higher sanhedrim that our Saviour speaks, Matt. v. 22; shewing different degrees of punishment to be apportioned to different offences; *Whoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment*, or lesser sanhedrim of twenty-three; *whoever shall call his brother unjustly raca* (a term of contempt, from רָקָא *empty*), *shall be in danger of the council*, or greater sanhedrim of seventy judges; *but he who shall say, Thou fool*, that is, cast odious appellations on his brother, *shall be in danger of γέεννα*, i. e. the valley of Hinnom, where idolatrous parents had burned children in the fire,—also called Tophet, תֹּפֶת, *a drum or tambourine*, which was beaten to drown the cries of the victims; a place fit to be an emblem of the punishment of the damned. Cooper's *Three Hundred Texts*, &c.

Synagogues were buildings in which the Jews assembled for prayer, for hearing and reading the Scriptures, and other instructions. Their origin is ascribed to Ezra; and to their erection it is said to be owing that the Jews returned no more to idolatry after the Babylonish captivity. Wherever Jews settled there was a synagogue; and heathens truly liberal sometimes built one for their use, despising idolatry, and admiring the worship of the true God. This was done by the centurion at Capernaum, Luke vii. 5: but in Acts xv. 21, we find that

Moses of old time had in EVERY city them that preached him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day. This has led some divines to ascribe an earlier origin than the days of Ezra to the synagogues; but Prideaux thinks differently: see, however, Psalm lxxiv. 8.

Christ rebuked the Pharisees for loving to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets. It was the love of being conspicuous—not the posture—which was blamed; for the publican in the Temple *stood*, though afar off, to pray.

In the synagogue was the ark or chest, containing the parchment-roll of the law on two staves, which were rolled or unrolled by the reader at any selected place. Hence our Saviour, in the synagogue of Nazareth, is said to have *opened the book*, Luke iv. 17; in the original ἀναπτύσσω, *to roll back*; and verse 20, to have closed the book again, πτύσσω, *to roll up*.

The officers of the synagogue were, 1. The rulers, Luke xiii. 14, ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, of whom were Jairus, Mark v. 22; Crispus, Acts xviii. 8; and Sosthenes, ver. 17: they regulated its concerns, and gave permission to persons to expound Scripture. 2. Next to the rulers was the angel of the church, or *sheliach zibbor*, שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוֹר, who offered public prayer to God for the whole congregation, Rev. ii. 3: Godwin's *Moses and Aaron*. 3. The *chazan*, חַזַּן, was inferior in dignity to the former officer, and had charge of the sacred books (the sacristan, whence our word *sexton*): he is called ὑπηρέτης, or *minister*, in Luke iv. 20.

78. *Discrepancies in the different accounts given by the evangelists of Christ's crucifixion, reconcileable.*

In the accounts of the crucifixion given by the evangelists we find the following discrepancies:—

I. Peter's denial of Christ is narrated by all the evangelists; but while Matthew, Luke, and John, mention *one* cock-crowing, Mark alone writes *before the cock crow TWICE*, Matt. xxvi. 34, Mark xiv. 30, Luke xxii. 34, John xiii. 38. Mark says *twice*, because he wrote his Gospel for the converts at Rome, where two cock-crowings were reckoned between midnight, *media nox*, and dawn, *diluculum*; these were *gallicinium* and *canticinium*:

Adam's *Roman Antiq.* p. 392. The object of St. Mark was to point out the time—a little before three in the morning. The Jews reckoned by one cock-crowing at three in the morning; as we see in Mark xiii. 35, where their four divisions of the night, according to the four watches of the Temple, are mentioned, ὥψέ, μεσονύκτιον, ἀλεκτοροφωνία, and πρωί, signifying nine, twelve, three, and six.

II. John says the trial of Christ took place about the *sixth* hour, John xix. 14. Mark says he was affixed to the cross at the *third* hour, Mark xv. 25; and Matthew and Luke, that after he had been three hours on the cross, the darkness prevailed over the land from the *sixth* to the *ninth* hour, when the Saviour gave up the ghost. The Jewish *artificial* day of twelve hours, from sunrise to sunset, was, at the passover, from six to six; and these three latter evangelists are particular in mentioning the hours, in order to exhibit the Lamb of God, or true Passover, as having hung on the cross from the time of the morning offering (nine A.M., or the third hour) to that of the evening sacrifice (three P.M., or the ninth hour).

Bloomfield and others, on the authority of Eusebius and several fathers, say, that as numbers in the ancient manuscripts were expressed by letters, the ς , or sign of *six*, has been mistaken for Γ , that of *three*, and that the word should be not ἔκτῃ, but τρίτῃ. But this will never answer. St. John states it was about the sixth hour, in the middle of the altercation respecting the sentence; and leaves no time (if that were indeed the *third* hour of the other evangelists) for the transactions with Herod, the scourging of the Saviour, the slow journey, through a dense crowd, to Calvary, under the weight of the transverse beam of the cross, and for the ceremony of affixing the transverse to the upright beam.

A stronger objection may be made to the supposition of Elsley, that the Jews divided their day into four portions; of which the first was from sunrise to the third hour, or nine in the morning; the second, from that to noon, &c.; and that any portion of intervening time between one portion and another was called by the name of the first hour of that portion, or sometimes by the last: when Mark says, therefore, it was the third

hour, he means any time of the three hours from the third to the sixth; when John says it was *about* the *sixth* hour, he means any hour previous to the *sixth*, or noon, which would very well answer to *eleven* in the morning for the hour of crucifixion.

But St. John says it was *about* the *sixth* hour at the time of the trial, and a little before he had said it was *early*, *πρωτα*, John xviii. 28; and St. Mark, that the *crucifixion*, or affixing to the cross, was *at* the third hour. The above explanation by Elsley takes no satisfactory notice of the third hour, and is exceedingly clumsy and confused. Why should not the third hour have been mentioned by Matthew, who wrote to the Jews?

The obvious and real reconciliation of the discrepancies is that of making St. John's computation to be the Roman *dies civilis*, which began the day at midnight, and was then adopted by all the people of Asia, as it now is in Europe, with the exception of Italy itself. Thus, John's sixth hour (being Roman) would be six o'clock in the morning; Mark's third hour (being Jewish) would be nine in the morning, the hour of the morning sacrifice; and Matthew and Luke's sixth to the ninth hour, the regular noon to three P.M. of the Jewish computation, the hour of the evening sacrifice,—that is, between the evenings, *בין הערבים*, Num. ix. 3.

III. On the Thursday before Christ suffered, his disciples prepared the passover for him; but the following day, Friday, is called the *preparation* of the passover, John xix. 14.

Now, it has always been thought that Friday was the real passover-day, when Christ, our passover, was sacrificed for us, and remained on the cross six hours, from the time of the morning to that of the evening sacrifice, suffering between the two evenings, Num. ix. 3, Exod. xii. 6, that is, as Josephus says, between three and five; and being taken down and buried before the Sabbath commenced, that is, according to the Jewish sacred computation (averse from the idolatrous worship of the sun), before six o'clock on Friday evening.

We are not told at what time the last supper was held; but if it was past six on Thursday evening, the real passover-day had then commenced; and Christ, foreseeing that his death

would prevent him from holding it at a later and the proper time, made an anticipatory commemoration as soon as the day began.

Many commentators are of opinion, however, that the last supper was held by Christ a day before the passover of the Jews; but they differ in their modes of explanation.

Cudworth thought that Thursday was really the 14th, being counted from the new moon as the 1st of Abib; from the phasis of which religious Jews would take their calendar rather than from a decree of the sanhedrim, which had fixed it for the Friday by mistake.

Scaliger and Casaubon likewise believe that Christ chose the passover-day appointed by the law, which the Jews postponed, that two Sabbaths might not happen together;—a most unlucky conjecture; for if they had *postponed* it to the Friday, it *made* two Sabbaths happen together—the Friday and the Saturday.

Grotius makes a difference between the paschal sacrifice and a supper commemorating the passover, which is all, in his opinion, that Christ held; and other learned men affirm that the last supper was a common meal, and no celebration of the passover at all.

Now, Matthew (xxvi. 17-19) and Mark (xiv. 12-18) call the supper the passover, and the *first day of unleavened bread*; while Luke represents our Lord as saying at that supper, *With desire have I desired to eat this PASSOVER with you BEFORE I SUFFER*,—which words seem to support the notion and explain the reason of an early commemoration on the 14th, in *literal* compliance with the Mosaic ordinance, *and ye shall eat the flesh of the slain lamb in that night* (the night ushering in the 14th, and part of it, beginning at six in the evening), *roast with fire, and unleavened bread; and let nothing remain until the morning*, Exod. xii. 6-11.

These commentators seem not to have made distinction between the passover and the *feast*. But the law enjoined, *in the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's passover, and on the fifteenth day is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord*, Levit. xxiii. 5, 6; and this is repeated in Num. xxviii. 16, 17, only the *feast* is simply mentioned.

It is remarkable that John, in speaking of the last supper, says expressly, that it was *BEFORE THE FEAST of the passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world, &c.* John xiii. 1; and he mentions the day of the crucifixion (Friday, 14th) as the preparation-day, the preparation of the Sabbath, John xix. 14, 31, 42; as St. Mark calls it, the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath; while St. Matthew (xxvii. 62) and Luke (xxiii. 50) call the day of the interment of Jesus the preparation, when the Sabbath drew on, adding, *they rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment.*

Christ was crucified on Friday the 14th, the real passover-day, when the Jewish officers *would not enter the judgment-hall of Pilate, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover*, John xviii. 28; and yet all the evangelists call that day the preparation, and John, the preparation of the passover; while the Jews would not suffer the bodies to remain on the cross beyond the day of the crucifixion, lest they should encroach on the Sabbath-day, *for that Sabbath was a high day* (John xix. 31), *the first day of the FEAST of unleavened bread*; although unleavened bread had been eaten with the passover, in conformity with Exod. xii. 6, &c.: which 15th day, or *Sabbath*, was a day of *holy convocation*, Exod. xii. 16, Levit. xxiii. 7, Num. xxviii. 18.

It is clear, then, that the last supper of Christ and his apostles was an early celebration of the passover on the real day, or the 14th, only in the former part of it instead of the evening, which customary time of the ceremony he waved, because he foresaw he would be dead before its arrival; and this explains St. John's words, *before the feast of the passover.*

The preparation of the disciples for the last supper was simply a making ready of the meal. The day of preparation, spoken of by the evangelists, was the preparation for the Sabbath and *feast* of unleavened bread; and if it be called by St. John (xix. 14) *the preparation of the passover*, this means—of the *passover-FEAST*, or passover-octave. It was a preparation of the 14th, the day of the passover, for the *feast*—not of the passover, but of unleavened bread, which feast began on the

15th. Before Christ was buried, the Jewish passover had been slain and eaten. None of the disciples, Joseph of Arimathea, Nicodemus, or the women, touched the body of Christ until the evening, or they could not legally have eaten the passover; and yet to the latest hour of evening that day was called the day of preparation; Mark calls it *παρασκευή* and *προσάββατον*, ch. xv. 42. The preparation of Christ's supper is described in Matt. xxvi. 17, Mark xi. 12, Luke xxii. 8, by the word *ἐτοιμάζω*.

N.B.—Parkhurst, under *πάσχα* (tit. iii.), is here in error in saying "the Jews, on the morning *after* the paschal lamb was eaten, were apprehensive lest their being defiled would prevent their eating *τὸ πάσχα*." They had not then eaten the paschal lamb or passover—that was (according to their custom) eaten in the evening; and for the exception made by the Lord of the passover, we have already given an account. See Whitby's dissertation on the day,—appendix to Matthew.

IV. All the four evangelists mention Peter's denial of Christ three times in the palace of Caiaphas; but they differ in minute particulars: they all agree, however, in saying the first question was put by a damsel, *παιδίσκη*: though even here John says she was the portress; and, in the true spirit of her place, asked the question before the apostle was admitted: Matthew says it was a certain damsel (*μία*), and that Peter was sitting in the hall or palace, only outside of the chamber of judgment, *ἔξω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ*: Mark, that Peter was *beneath* in the *hall*, *ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ κάτω* (a few steps leading up from the hall to the court), and that the damsel was one of the maids of the high-priest: Luke writes that the apostle was sitting by the fire in the *middle* of the hall, *ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς*. Thus he might be *outside* in the hall, *beneath* in the hall, and in the *middle* of the hall,—all without any contradiction.

The second question was proposed, according to Matthew by another damsel, *ἄλλη*: to Mark, by the same damsel, *ἡ παιδίσκη*, improperly rendered *a* maid, for it should be *the* maid. According to Luke, it was not certainly any damsel at all, but another person, *ἑτερος*, decidedly of the masculine, or at any rate the epicene gender: while John is silent as to the gender, but makes the inquiry in the plural number, *εἶπον*, *they said*; probably the

servants and officers, which is very likely, for they might be all speaking at once; and we might be sure the *παῖδες* would not be silent in such a conference.

Then as to the third question, three of the writers say it was put by the bystanders, — as the common people say, “promiscuously;” but John fastens it upon the kinsman of Malchus, whose ear Peter had cut off, and who would, no doubt, bear him a grudge.

To those who delight in petty criticism, and, when the grand truth is certain, could draw an argument against Scripture from such trifles, we may say: All these versions of the story may be true; for Peter was in a mood to deny to the portress, and every one else who might ask him, that he knew Jesus, for the *expedience* of being near his Master; and in a nocturnal tumult in the outer hall of a tribunal—particularly where there were a number of women—a question might be asked by many persons: nor is there any thing in the position of Peter, or state of the hall, not reconcileable to all the statements, Matt. xxvi. 69, &c. Mark xiv. 66, &c. Luke xxii. 56, &c. John xviii. 16, &c.

V. The next discrepancy in the accounts of the crucifixion is, that Matthew (xxvii. 44) describes *both* the thieves as reviling our Saviour on the cross; while Luke (xxiii. 39) relates that the one rebuked the other, and, being converted, that he received a promise of paradise.

Some imagine that both the thieves reviled our Lord at first. But in this, as in other instances, one evangelist speaks indefinitely, and in the plural *they*; while another specifies the individual speaker. Compare Matt. xiv. 17, *THEY say unto him*, with John vi. 8, *ANDREW said*, and Matt. xxviii. 8, *THEY had indignation*, with John xii. 4, *JUDAS ISCARIOT had indignation*. Why the Holy Spirit forebore to indite the story of the penitent thief to Matthew, or Mark, or John, it is not for us to inquire. It holds out at once a consolatory and a dangerous example: “*one* effectual death-bed repentance, that none might despair; and *but one*, that none might presume.” But when Matthew says the thieves mocked him, he may allude to a period of the crucifixion when one was a spokesman and the other silent.

“If a man,” says Carson, “passing a jail is struck by some-

thing cast by a prisoner from the window of his cell, shall he be charged as a liar when he says the prisoners struck him? So Matthew ascribes to the thieves what was done by one of them."

Ammon says, Matthew used the species for the individual; a clumsy way of saying (if he meant to say), the plural for the singular. Luke, who alone mentions the different conduct of the thieves, narrates the whole story.

VI. On the cross the *soldiers* brought Christ vinegar, Luke **xxiii.** 36; but in John **xix.** 20, *one* of them only did it. In Mark **xvi.** 5 and Matthew **xxviii.** 2, there is *one* angel; but *two* are found in Luke **xxiv.** 4 and John **xx.** 12. The explanation respecting the thieves will solve both difficulties.

VII. During the crucifixion two draughts were administered to our Lord, the one at the beginning of his sufferings, and the other just before he expired, Matt. **xxvii.** 34, 48, Mark **xv.** 23, 36. Before our Lord was hoisted from the ground, the first potion (given probably by the heathen soldiers in humanity) was not placed on a reed or in a sponge. Luke and John speak only of the second; and the allusion to the gall is mentioned only by Matthew in persuading the Jews.

Concerning the former, Matthew (**xxvii.** 34) writes, *they gave him to drink vinegar mingled with gall*, ὄξος μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον, which he tasted; but in Mark (**xv.** 23); it is wine mingled with myrrh, ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον. There is no difficulty about the ὄξος and οἶνος, for the latter was *vinaigre*, a light, new, and acid liquor; — *posca*, the ordinary beverage of the Roman soldiers. The word χολή, literally *gall*, is used in Hellenistic Greek to signify any thing bitter; and St. Matthew, in his Greek version, used the word in order to point out to the Jewish converts the fulfilment of their own Scripture, Psalm **lxix.** 21, *they gave me GALL for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink*. Here we conceive that David's "gall" was figurative, as in the unconverted persons being *in the GALL of bitterness*, Acts **viii.** 23, Lam. **iii.** 19. Mark, knowing it to be a custom to give criminals a stupifying cup — wine (the *posca*) flavoured with a grain of frankincense — calls the potion myrrhed wine: and Harris, in his *Natural History of the Bible*, says that Mark, having seen

the original Hebrew of Matthew's Gospel, found the word מַר, as signifying *gall*, or any thing bitter, and was thus led to his translation of *myrrhed wine*. Mark's, however, was the exact account; and Matthew's *χολή* figurative.

There are three versions of the second potion. Matthew and Mark say it saturated a sponge, σπόγγος, which was raised on a reed, καλάμῃ. John (xix. 29) repeats the particulars of the sponge and the vinegar, but mounts the sponge on a hyssop, ὑσσώπῳ. There is said to be a hyssop in the East with a stalk two feet long. *Reed* may be the name for every slender rod; as in English *cane*. This would be sufficient to raise the vinegar to the lips of the sufferer; for it is quite a vulgar error to suppose the cross raised high above the ground. Κάλαμος denotes the stem of slender shrubs bearing any kind of wood. Newcome, Beausobre, and L'Enfant.

VIII. The inscription on the cross was, by the account of Matthew (xxvii. 57), οὗτος ἔστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων: Mark (xv. 26), ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων: Luke (xxiii. 38), οὗτος ἔστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων: John (xix. 19), Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. All agree in the *king of the Jews*; and Matthew and John give Ἰησοῦς. "The words," says Bloomfield, "were inscribed on a metal plate, with black characters on a white ground." When an inscription cannot all be crowded into a board, it is usual to write the less important words in small letters; and this may have been the case with οὗτος ἔστιν Ἰησοῦς. The common abbreviation of painters, I.N.R.I., is barbarous, and would only serve for the Latin of John. The Greek would have been B.I., i. e. βασιλεὺς Ἰουδαίων, and the Hebrew מַלְכֵּנוּ, i. e. מַלְכֵּנוּ יְהוּדָא. But the whole of the words were probably not written in the different languages. The wavering Pilate, afraid of being accused to his master, wrote such an inscription as made a compromise with his conscience. As a politician, he confirmed the loyalty of all the people by saying, Here he hangs, whether king or not. Yet he dreaded to refuse the claims of Jesus; though it would be necessary to mention to Jews only the name of JESUS, who pretended to *save his people from their sins*. The capital charge—intended to go forth to the Gentiles, and reach the Roman emperor,—

that of making himself a king, is blazoned in all the four accounts, as we might suppose it would be. The name *Jesus* is mentioned by Matthew as an ambiguous title—compliment or sneer, as the Jews might take it; and by St. John accompanied with *Nazarene*, a term of reproach. The whole tallies with Pilate's time-serving, expedience-consulting, believing and hesitating, "what-is-truth" character, in which way soever it was written.

IX. We read in St. Matthew (xxvii. 46), that about the ninth hour, that is, the close of our Lord's sufferings, he *cried with a loud voice*, 'ΗΛΙ, 'ΗΛΙ, λαμὰ σαβαχθαυ; that is, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* words evidently taken, as a fulfilment of prophecy, from Psalm xxii. 1, אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִי מַה לָּךְ, where our Saviour, speaking in the Syriac dialect, substitutes *sabachthani* for *azabthani*: but in St. Mark's Gospel (xv. 34), the cry of the Saviour is 'Ελωι, 'Ελωι, λαμμὰ σαβαχθαυ; this way of spelling the word occurs in three places of the Old Testament. It is אֱלֹהֵי in Psalm xviii. 47, cxxxiv. 10, cxlv. 1.

Parkhurst (art. 'Ελωι) makes these two distinct cries—one *about* and another *at* the ninth hour; and discovers a peculiar propriety in the change of expression,—the 'ΗΛΙ of Matthew being an appeal to the omnipresence, power, and providence of the Father; and the latter to his being engaged to take part in the sufferings of Christ up to the last moment, when the humanity alone expired. He adds, that in all the three passages where 'Ελωι is found, it alluded either to the sufferings or future triumph of the Messiah. This, however, seems a Hutchinsonian gloss. It is much more likely, that as *azabthani* was altered, the words 'Ελωι and λαμμὰ (with double μ) were the Galilean pronunciation of the quotation from Psalm xxii. That Galilee, bordering on Syria, had a particular dialect, is evident from the words addressed to St. Peter, *thy speech bewrayeth thee*. The words *talitha khoumi* and *ethpatha* (ܬܠܝܬܐ ܚܘܡܝ) were Syriac; and therefore *talitha khoumi* in Syriac means—*my lamb, arise*, and shews the Saviour's tenderness. 'Εθαθα in Syriac is 'Εφφαθα in Hebrew. Newcome says 'Ελωι is Syriac.

X. In Matthew (xxvii. 54), the centurion, after the death of

Christ, exclaims, *Truly* (not pretendedly) *this was the Son of God*, ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος: Mark (xv. 42), *Truly* (and not pretendedly) *this MAN was the Son of God*, ἀληθῶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν Θεοῦ: and Luke (xxiii. 47) says, *he glorified τὸν Θεόν, God*, the true God, saying, *Certainly this was a righteous man*, ὅντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν,—rather, *This man was thoroughly righteous*, δίκαιος, *righteous in principle*. John is silent on the subject.

Whitby tries to reconcile these texts by distributing the words among the soldiers, some of whom said, he was the Son of God, and some, that he was a righteous person. But though the authority of Matthew might favour this supposition, both Mark and Luke fix the exclamation personally on the centurion alone. Grotius, Campbell, and some others, translate the two first evangelists, *A Son of God*, as an innocent person. But it was universally known in Jerusalem that Jesus suffered, not as *a* Son of God, but as *the* Son of God, because he, being a man, made himself God, John x. 33; which destroys at once the Socinian and Arian hypothesis, as well as Whitby's notion, that he was conceived to be only the beloved and adopted, not the only begotten and eternal Son of God. The expression in St. Luke, *This man was δίκαιος, righteous*, implied he was what he claimed to be—the Son of God.

XI. Matthew and Mark represent Joseph of Arimathea as interring our Lord's body in the evening (ὀψίας γενομένης) of the day of preparation, or Friday. Luke also says it was the day of preparation, and the Sabbath *dawned*, ἐπέφωσκε.

The Jewish Sabbath began in the evening, and the verb *to dawn* is used metaphorically for *to draw on*. John (xix. 42) says that Jesus was interred on the Jews' preparation-day; and by the Mosaic law (Deut. xxi. 23), a body hanged on a tree was to be buried the same day, and not to remain all night.

XII. This note will explain the only other text wherein the word occurs, viz. Matt. xxviii. 1: ὁπὲρ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, *came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, &c.* Here the word ὁπὲρ signified when the Sabbath was completely past, or, as Mark expresses it, διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου, completely over, including the following night; and ἐπιφωσκούσῃ

is taken literally for the earliest gleam of dawn. The Jewish reverence for the Sabbath, although it began at six on Friday evening, was extended to the whole of Saturday night.

XIII. But this visit, by the two Marys according to St. Matthew (xxvii. 61), *Mary Magdalene and the other Mary*; according to Mark (xvi. 1), *Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome*; in St. Luke (xxiii. 54), by these two Marys, and *Joanna, and other women*; in St. John (xx. 1), by *Mary Magdalene* alone,—is said by St. Mark to be at the rising of the sun, and by St. John while it was yet dark: Mark, ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου: John, πρῶτ, σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης: and Luke, ὄρθρον βαθείος. All this applies to the second visit on Sunday morning.

St. Mark makes Mary the mother of Joses the other Mary who accompanied Mary Magdalene on the *Friday evening*: the original says, *Mary of Joses*. Qy. was it the mother of Jesus? But St. John's silence about those who accompanied Mary Magdalene to the sepulchre, on the second visit, does not exclude the *other women*.

St. John, in his supplemental history, gives a detailed account of Mary Magdalene's conduct on the occasion; and indeed she says (on the morning of the resurrection) to St. Peter, οὐκ οἶδαμεν, *we know not where they have laid the Lord*; which implies that others were with her, though she was the chief speaker.

Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Joses (qy. *Jesus?*), followed to the sepulchre on the *Friday evening*, to mark the place (Matt. xxvii. 61, Mark xv. 47), and returned, and prepared spices and ointments that night, i. e. still before six in the evening, and rested the Saturday, or Sabbath, Luke xxiii. 55, 56. But *the women* generally, having prepared their spices on Friday evening, and rested the whole of Saturday, set out, in their zeal, on our Lord's-day morning, while it was yet dark, and came to the sepulchre at the sun-rising.

There seems no occasion to encumber the narrative with two separate parties of women, each carrying spices.

XIV. Matthew (xxvii. 61) calls the sepulchre of Joseph τάφος; but he himself (ver. 60) gives it the name of μνημεῖον.

Matthew (xxviii. 2) says, *the angel of the Lord rolled back the stone from the door of the sepulchre (τάφος), and sat upon it.* Mark (xvi. 5) calls the person a *young man*, sitting *within* the sepulchre (μνημεῖον), clothed in a white robe, at the right side. Luke (xxiv. 2, 8) relates, that finding at the entrance of the μνημεῖον the stone rolled away from the τάφος, the women entered the μνημεῖον, and saw *two men* in shining garments. John (xx. 1) relates, that Mary, seeing in the same manner the stone rolled away, ran to meet Peter and John; that John and Peter went into the μνημεῖον, and found that their Master was gone (i. e. from the τάφος); and that Mary also stooped down and looked into the sepulchre, and saw, within the μνημεῖον, *two angels* in white, sitting. Matthew speaks of an angel; Mark, of a young man; Luke, of two men; and John, of two angels.

And what difficulty is here? The angels assumed the likeness and form of men; and if there were two, and one of them the speaker, a historian might speak of one or both: just as of the two thieves.

The Rabbins say that a sepulchre should have a court before it six cubits square, from which you pass to the door which leads into the cave, or immediate place of sepulture. The sepulchre is called μνημεῖον by all the evangelists; and it was altogether cut out of a rock. The τάφος of St. Matthew was the cave or place where the body was laid. What was in the τάφος was of course within the μνημεῖον; but what was in the μνημεῖον was not necessarily within the τάφος. It was over against the τάφος, and within the μνημεῖον, that Mary Magdalene and the other Mary sat on the evening of the crucifixion. And to make all sure, on the following day—the Sabbath—the chief-priests obtained a guard for the τάφος, on which (having first, no doubt, seen that the dead body—which lay on a low shelf, without any thing like a coffin—was there) they rolled a large stone, and sealed it, and placed the guard of forty soldiers to watch the whole μνημεῖον, including the τάφος.

The μνημεῖον was a showy building or front, which the Pharisees adorned and whitened—whence our Saviour compares them to *whited* sepulchres; and although the word here is τάφος, it refers to the bones and rottenness within, Matt. xxiii. 27.

But the *μνημεῖον*, when not thus distinguished by adornment, was often unconsciously approached; it was sometimes a vault having cells in the chamber beneath, *ράφοι*; and hence our Lord compares these Pharisees to *graves which appear not* (for they were sometimes dug perpendicularly), so that *the men who walk over them* (*ἐπάνω*) *are not aware of them* (Luke xi. 44) as unclean things. It is not unlikely, after all, that the words were in common speech used promiscuously; like our own *monument* or *tomb*, and *grave* or *sepulchre*.

Every thing now is quite plain—the *garden* of Joseph of Arimathea was the small court: the *μνημεῖον* was divided into two parts, of which the inner was the cave or *ράφος*: the evangelists perfectly agree; for the angel or angels, and the stone, were all on the right-hand side of the *ράφος*, and within the *μνημεῖον*. Mary Magdalene was ignorant of the spices which Nicodemus had applied, and also of the seal which the chief-priests had set. The *μνημεῖον* was always open; and the soldiers must have been on the outside of the sepulchre, and probably of the court.

The only word remaining to be explained is the *stooping down* to look into the *μνημεῖον*, ascribed to Peter by Luke (xxiv. 12), and to Mary Magdalene by John (xx. 11). The entrances of tombs in the East were made low, to prevent the abstraction of the body, or desecration of the remains, by avaricious men, or by beasts of prey. To this day the holy sepulchre—or what is shewn for it—has an entrance to the *μνημεῖον* so low that travellers creep under to get at it; and then you come to the part where devotees pray, and to the sepulchre, on one side of that small square chapel or chamber, which contains, or is, the proper cave or *ράφος*.

Though it may be stepping aside to identify this sepulchre with that of our Lord now shewn, we may observe, that the chapel of the holy sepulchre, within the church (the court), may be regarded as the burying-place or garden of Joseph; and though in the reign of Adrian, A.D. 118, it was buried under a mound of earth, its place was still indicated by the ensigns of idolatry planted over it, till Constantine (A.D. 306) ordered the earth to be removed, and a magnificent temple to be built over it. Then, Eusebius writes

(A.D. 337), the cave, *the holy of holies*, obtained a similitude of our Saviour's resurrection,—meaning, that in a Jewish sepulchre the chapel imitated the court of the Temple, while the *μνημεῖον*, or side-chamber, represented the *sanctuary*, and the *τάφος*, *the holy of holies*; which gives an additional signification to the resurrection of our Lord. The church built by the mother of Constantine still remains; nor is there any reason to question the identity of the situation. Dr. Richardson and some others have said that the stone is not the same as that of Jerusalem; but have they seen whether this may not be a casing? If, however, the substance of the rock, or even if the place itself, be a mistake, our argument remains. Clarke, Buckingham, and some others, have pretended to find the tomb in the valley of Hinnom, — though *that* by their absurd hypothesis was within the city, — not an *antitype*, as being *without the camp*; and any graves it contained must have been made after the destruction of Jerusalem, Exod. xxxiii. 7, Heb. xiii. 13. See White's *Diatessaron*, Thirlwall's edition; also Burton on Matt. xxvii.

The *μνημεῖον*, or monument, among several ancient nations, consisted of the cave, or *τάφος*, *σπήλαιον* = פֶּתֶחַ, and the court, פֶּתַח = τὸ ὑπαίθριον, the place in the open air; and both these stood within a larger space of ground, called by the Romans *tutela monumenti*. This is the *garden* of Joseph of Arimathea; and the *μνημεῖον* was the whole chamber, containing cells, or shelves, hewn in the walls, each of which was a *τάφος*. There is a plate in the folio edition of Calmet illustrative of this subject.

Lucianus mentions the cave as seen in his time, A.D. 311, apud Rufin. ix. 6; Athanasius, A.D. 326, speaks of the tomb being worshipped; and Cyril, A.D. 412, distinguishes the *μνήμα* and the *τάφος*: *ὅπου ἐτέθη, καὶ ὁ ἐπιτεθείς τῇ θύρᾳ λίθος, ὁ μέχρι σήμερον παρὰ τῷ μνημείῳ κείμενος*.

We must add, that these remarks are offered in contradiction to several high authorities: Macknight, Lardner, Doddridge, and others, think that the appearances at the resurrection were seen distributively to two companies of women; and that Luke (xxiv. 10) has thrown all the facts together as they were severally told, and blended them into one mass.

The witnesses were, according to Bloomfield and Townsend,

1. the appearance of one angel to Mary the mother of Christ [but I am not able to discover this important person in the whole business, unless she be the Mary called by Mark *the mother of Joses*, who went on the Friday evening to the sepulchre, but then, so far as appears, saw no angel]; 2. of two angels to Mary Magdalene; 3. a second appearance to all the women; 4. two angels to the women when they came out of the tomb. Each, it is said, had something to relate. The ἀγγεῖλαν ταῦτα πάντα relates to Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Joanna, Luke xxiv. 10; the ἀπαγγέλλουσα to Mary Magdalene; the ἔλεγον ταῦτα to the whole company of women who followed Jesus, Luke xxiii. 55, xxiv. 9. All this appears to me to be one mass of confusion, and quite unsupported by facts. On the whole, we conclude with Grotius, that the several accounts contain no differences which amount to contradictions.

XV. The last discrepancy we shall mention relates to the death of Judas, who, as Matthew (xxvii. 3) relates, went out in despair and hanged himself; but by the testimony of Peter (Acts ii. 18), *falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and his bowels gushed out.*

Weston says, in Bowyer's *Annotations*, that he *tried* to commit suicide, but the rope broke, and occasioned the subsequent catastrophe. He was a suicide in intention,—the only one, with the exception of Saul and Ahitophel, in the whole Bible.

At the close of these observations, we would pause, and consider how exceedingly captious and inconsiderable these and other objections are, and how very easily the discrepancies may be explained and reconciled.

A narrative (says Horne, vol. i. p. 587) is not to be rejected by reason of some diversity of circumstances with which it is related, for the character of human testimony is substantial truth under circumstantial variety; while a close agreement induces suspicion of confederacy and fraud. Important variations, and even contradictions, are not always deemed sufficient to shake the credibility of a fact. There are similar discrepancies in profane histories, and yet the historians are of unimpeached veracity: as Livy and Polybius, Cæsar and Plutarch, Philo and

Josephus. But, after all, a little attention suffices to reconcile the apparent discrepancies; and both accounts may be consistent. The chameleon may have two colours—the shield a gold and silver side, as seen by different knights. Criticism must here consider the *design* of the writer—which may be to make a supplement to another narrative, or to oppose a particular adversary. The style, the age, the country of the writers, is also to be taken into account—the state of the language at the time, and the changes of the government. All this comports with plenary inspiration—*plenary* as to the great facts and doctrines, and guarded from material error as to the style and minute unimportant particulars.

But what book has been so zealously assailed, so assiduously searched, and so minutely tortured, as the Bible? what book so criticised, and hated, and scoffed at by infidels? what book so anatomised to the minutest letters, and so candidly vindicated by throwing the examination into an arena, and challenging every inquiry? Yet thus treated it has borne the brunt of all the malevolence of heathens, the inveteracy of wicked men, the scrutiny of cold philologists, and still remains uninjured. It has seen generations pass away, fashions change, and science advance or recede, in a long course of centuries; and it is still fresh as in youth in its adaptations to all changes: it has beamed in the brightest seat of science, and visited barbarous climes; and is equally suited to civilised and savage life. It is a wonderful production: a document in two parts harmonising and tallying together; the former long and still in the custody of the enemies to the latter, yet full of type and prophecy, indicating both to come from the same omniscience, power, and mercy. It is a miscellany composed by many men, in various ages, in different styles, incapable of acting in a collusion or conspiracy of deception, yet having the strictest unity, and bearing on one great and common point—a book speaking of events and circumstances, which no advancement of science, no philosophy, natural or moral, has ever successfully contradicted—a blessing to mankind—a proof of its own truth—an information of the ignorant—a solace of the poor—a star of hope to the afflicted—and a haven of rest to the weary.

79. *'Αρχιερεῖς in the plural, particularly as applied to Annas and Caiaphas.*

Originally, in the flourishing period of Jewish history, there was and could be only one high-priest at a time, who held that office for life. But after Judea became a Roman province, this officer, who had enjoyed an almost royal authority, was changed at the will of the conquerors. Some imagine that the high-priesthood was venal, and some that it was changed annually. Josephus (lib. xviii. ch. 2, § 2) gives an account of four successive changes in the high-priesthood in two years, and terminating with Caiaphas, all being appointed by Valerius Gratus, the predecessor of Pilate. But it is more probable, that by the expression of Luke (iii. 2) *Annas and Caiaphas being high-priests*, Caiaphas was the real high-priest, and Annas his *sagan*, or deputy — a title given him by Josephus. The *sagan* occasionally performed the functions of the high-priest; but from another expression in John (xi. 49), *Caiaphas being high-priest that SAME YEAR*, and from the mistake of the multitude in carrying our Lord to ANNAS first (John xviii. 13), some suppose that Annas had been high-priest the year before, and, being father-in-law to Caiaphas, held still a portion of authority.

But though the regular high-priest, who alone entered the holy of holies, was a type of Christ (Heb. ix. 7, &c.), and could be by the Mosaic law but one; although, in cases of illness or legal disqualification — by the accidental touching of a dead body, &c. — he might have a *sagan*, or second priest (2 Kings xxiii. 18), — yet those who had formerly borne the high-priest's office, and the heads of the twenty-four sacerdotal courses or families (1 Chron. xxiv.) were called in Hebrew קָהָן הַכֹּהֲנִים (2 Chron. xxxvi. 14, Ezra, viii. 24, x. 5, Nehem. xii. 7), while they are styled by Josephus ἀρχιερεῖς, *Antiq.* lib. xi. ch. 7, § 8; &c. In his *Life* there is mention made of πολλοὺς τῶν ἀρχιερέων, agreeably to the New Testament, Matt. ii. 4, Mark xi. 27, Luke xxii. 52, John vii. 32, and other places. In Acts (xix. 14), Sceva is called a *chief of the priests*, ἀρχιερεύς. These were the chief-priests of Joshua, Nehem. xii. 7; of Matthew xxvii. 12; Mark xiv. 1; Luke xxiii. 23; John xix. 15; Acts xxii. 30, *et passim*.

80. *Assuming the divine original of Christianity, prove the divine original of the Mosaic dispensation.*

When St. Paul writes to Timothy, that the holy Scriptures, in which he had been instructed from a child, *are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus*, he alludes to the Old Testament Scriptures, which were alone published at that time; and which taught those who read them attentively, through type and prophecy, the faith in Christ Jesus by anticipation, 2 Tim. iii. 15, A.D. 66. The Old Testament would have been unintelligible without the Gospel as a key; but when the key is found, and opens the lock, it is a proof that they proceed from the same intelligence, that they are counterparts of the same plan, and that the lock was made for the purpose of being opened by that key. Thus, the Old and New Testaments dovetail into each other. The same remark applies to the following verse (the 16th), *All Scripture is given by inspiration of God*: here it is the Old Testament that is spoken of—the *law and the prophets*; as also where we read of the Gospel as announced by the previous dispensations, *As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began*, Luke i. 70. Our Saviour quotes Moses and the prophets, as of equal authority in teaching a future state with a spirit sent from the dead, Luke xvi. 31, xx. 37. Moses and Elias, the representatives of the law and the prophets, appeared with him in glory on the mount of transfiguration; Matt. xvii. 3. Stephen, in his address, connects the Old and New Testament, shewing the former to be the preparatory dispensation, only spiritualised by the latter: and to the same effect are our Saviour's words, *I am not come to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil*; while the whole sermon on the mount refers to these sacred books, and draws out their spiritual meaning. *Search the Scriptures*, said he to the Jews—that is, the Old Testament—they are they which testify of me: and when he says, *If ye had believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me* (John v. 46), the converse of the proposition is not less true, *If ye believe me, ye must needs believe Moses*; for I am his passover, his scape-goat, his high-priest, and the prophet like unto himself whom he foretold. *The testimony of Jesus is*

the spirit of PROPHECY (Rev. xix. 10), is a convertible proposition. *To him bare all the prophets witness*, Acts x. 13. Thus, the New Testament, when admitted, sanctions and proves the Old; as that again, when admitted, proves the New.

81. *Prophecies proving Jesus to be the Messiah.*

It was prophesied, that *the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head*, Gen. iii. 15; that *a prophet, like unto Moses, who had seen God face to face, should arise*, Deut. xxxiv. 10; that *in him all nations of the earth should be blessed*, Gen. xxii. 18; that *he should be of the seed of Abraham, the tribe of Judah, and family of David*, Gen. xxvi. 4, xlix. 10, Isa. xi. 1, 2; that *he should be born at Bethlehem*, Micah v. 2; that *he should preach the Gospel to the poor, and work miracles*, Isa. lxi. 1, xxxv. 5; that *he should be despised and rejected of men*, Isa. liii. 3; that *he should be sold for thirty pieces of silver*, Zachar. xi. 12, 13; *get gall and vinegar to drink during his sufferings*, Ps. lxix. 21; that *a bone of him should not be broken*, Ps. xxxiv. 20; that *his enemies should part his cloak, and cast lots for his tunic or vesture*, Ps. xxii. 18; and that *he should appear at the end of 490 years from the going forth of the commandment for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, after the Babylonish captivity*, Dan. ix. 24-26. When I find an individual responding to all these, and many other scattered indications of prophecy—the only one who ever accurately responded to all of them, or could respond; and when I know that the time—being that foretold—precludes all future manifestation,—I conclude that the sure word of prophecy shews this Jesus to be the predicted and true Messiah.

82. Ἦν τις βασιλικός, οὗ ὁ υἱὸς ἡσθένει ἐν Καπερναούμ, John iv. 46.

Βασιλικός does not mean a courtier or servant about the court, as Parkhurst and Bloomfield would have it, but rather, according to Whitby, a great man of Herod's court, *Comment.* p. 427. It is an adjective signifying *royal*, with a substantive understood; and this may be δούλος or διάκονος, or other word, according to the dignity of the officer. The Syriac is *obed melek*; but so the highest subject is called. Tremellius writes,

“qui vices regis gerebat, et regius erat minister,”—a viceroy; which, in the instance before us, is improbable. Hieronymus says, “Regulus, qui Græcè dicitur βασιλικός, quem nos de aula regia rectius interpretare possumus, *palatinum*.” WETSTEIN.

83. *The prophets, greater and lesser.*

Of the sixteen prophets, the four greater are—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel; and they have received the title, not merely on account of the bulk of their writings, but because they bear more ample testimony to Jesus and the blessings to be diffused by the Gospel than the lesser prophets. Isaiah, in particular, is called the evangelical prophet; but Jeremiah also speaks of the Messiah as *the Lord our righteousness*, and of a *new covenant*, which should enlarge and purify the Mosaic religion, and in some respects supersede it: Ezekiel, of a great Shepherd, by the name of David, long after the death of that prince, who should confer such blessings as Isaiah and Jeremiah had prescribed: and Daniel foretells a glorious and everlasting kingdom, which should succeed the four monarchies of his prophecy; nay, and fixes the time when the long-expected Messiah should be cut off, *not for himself, but for the iniquity of his people*. The lesser prophets throw in smaller particulars, pointing, however, directly to the same Messiah: they fill up the grand outlines of the four superior prophets.

84. Τοῦτο πάλιν δεύτερον σημεῖον ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐλθὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, John iv. 54.

The first miracle which our Lord wrought in Galilee was the conversion of water into wine at the marriage-feast of Cana; the second was the restoring to life the son of the nobleman at Capernaum (John iv. 13, &c. ii. 3), *This is again the second miracle which Jesus did when he was come out of Judea into Galilee*, John iv. 54. He came on earth to encourage cheerfulness, and to console sorrow. They are near together, in time and in place—a garden, and in the midst of it a sepulchre. *Rejoice with trembling.*

85. *Had the Jews, as a distinct people, any theatrical representations? If not, how do you account for the mention of theatres in various parts of the New Testament? (Sisson, verbatim.)*

It does not appear that the Jews, as a distinct people, had any theatrical representations: but the apostles travelled into various countries, where both theatres and amphitheatres were deemed necessary appendages to the chief towns; and it was natural to them, without expressing approbation of either edifice or entertainment, to illustrate solemn and lofty truths by a figurative reference to those representations, in which the people so greatly delighted. Thus at Corinth, in the immediate neighbourhood of the Isthmian games, St. Paul speaks with propriety of the Christian course as a race and a wrestling-match, 1 Cor. ix. 24, 25. And he acquaints the same people, that the apostles, being *appointed to death, are made a spectacle (θέατρον) to men and angels*, 1 Cor. iv. 9. The theatre at Ephesus was the usual place of resort, whether for occupation or pleasure, as being a large space capable of accommodating a crowd, Acts xix. 29. The theatre was designed for dramas: the amphitheatre, which was circular or oval, was built for shows of gladiators and combats of wild beasts—like the Arena at Verona, or the Colosseum at Rome; but in Scripture, it is probable that the word *θέατρον* signifies either building. An allusion to the spectators at an amphitheatre is conveyed in this phrase in Heb. xii. 1, *we are encompassed with a cloud of witnesses*; and from the same quarter are taken the words *ἀγών* (1 Tim. vi. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 7) and *ἀγωνίζομαι*, Luke xiii. 24, Colos. i. 29, iv. 12, John xviii. 36, 1 Cor. ix. 25, &c.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to the Christianised Jews dispersed in the persecution which followed the martyrdom of Stephen; and these must have dwelt in cities where such entertainments prevailed, and such terms were familiar.

The word *ἐπιχορηγία*, used in Ephes. iv. 16 and Philip. i. 19, is derived from the contributions made in Greek cities for the support of their choral exhibitions in their theatres; but it is metaphorical.

86. *St. Mark omits several acts of our Lord mentioned by St. Matthew and St. Luke: what is inferred from this?*

As St. Matthew's Gospel had been written for the use of the Jews, and St. Luke's for that of the Gentiles, the object of St. Mark was to draw up a simple compendium, for the instruction of the Christian converts at Rome. The two other evangelists having dwelt so largely on the circumstances of our Lord's birth and infancy, St. Mark comes at once to his public ministry, the previous facts being sufficiently known. He copies largely from both, though introducing separate facts—probably communicated by St. Peter. While Matthew and Luke introduce our Lord as calling himself *the Son of man*, St. Mark's first words are, *the Gospel of the Son of God*—a just and fearless title, attracting the attention of the Romans. He omits the genealogy, and the massacre of Bethlehem (both so eminently important to the Jews), with the sermon on the mount, exposing the hypocritical austerity of the Pharisees, about which Gentiles would be ignorant and regardless. On the other hand, he inserts particulars for the instruction of converted Romans—such as the explanation of what was *defiled* or *common* among the Jewish people, chap. vii. 2; and, in verses 3 and 4, explains the peculiarities of Jewish discipline. In speaking of Cyrenius (xix. 11), he calls him *father of Alexander and Rufus*, those two being at that time in Rome. Every thing indicates that the book was written for Roman disciples. St. Mark's Gospel abounds with Hebraisms and Latinisms, being evidently written by a man whose vernacular language was the Syro-Chaldee, but who had learned Hellenistic Greek from the Septuagint and Alexandrine writers, and picked up Latin phrases in his sojourn at Rome. Mark abstains from allusion to Jewish customs, and from quoting the Jewish Scriptures, as writing to Gentiles.

87. *The Holy Scriptures are not of modern contrivance.*

The well-known translation of the Septuagint affords assurance, confirmed by the catalogues of Josephus and Philo, that the Old Testament at least existed 277 years before Christ; and with respect to the New Testament, a number of Christian

writers, some contemporary with the apostles, and others within the year of our era 200, whose works are yet extant,—Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch,—quote the books of the evangelists and apostles as they now stand: to say nothing of Barnabas and Hermas, whose fragments are preserved by Eusebius, A.D. 337.

In the year 1740, a manuscript of the second century was discovered by Muratori in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, containing a regular list of the books of the New Testament as they now stand, omitting only the Epistle to the Hebrews, and one of those of John, viz. the second: it is published in Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. iv. Early in the second century Justin Martyr cites the memorials of the apostles, exhibiting throughout a close agreement with the Gospels; Conybeare's *Introd. Lect.*, p. 73. Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, Townson's *Discourses on the Gospels*, and Blunt *On the Undesigned Coincidences of the Gospels and Acts*, subject these books to the strictest cross-examination, and discover such marks of truth as add the force of internal to that of external evidence. All this has been confirmed by Josephus, and other contemporary pagan authors, who mention the facts related by the apostles, and without any discrepancy which has not been satisfactorily reconciled. That several spurious writings were sent forth, is admitted, as might be expected; and St. Luke opens his Gospel by declaring that *many* had taken the narrative in hand: but this only caused an early care in the church to separate the genuine from the suspected documents. The four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, 1 Peter and 1 John, were generally received, as never having been disputed; to which Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 Epist. of John, Jude, and the Revelation, were afterwards added; shewing the extreme scrupulousness with which the canon was settled.

88. *Is the present story of Christianity the same in substance which the apostles promulgated?*

There is abundant proof that the apostles and others suffered much persecution and underwent dangers in support of some mar-

vellous fact; so that the question is, "Whether the story which the Christians have now be the story which the Christians had then?" and some proofs may be stated, prior to any consideration of the testimony supporting the authority of the history.

I. There is no vestige of any other story—nay, heathen writers go along with it, though at first speaking of it ignorantly and contemptuously: they shew that one Jesus was put to death as a malefactor; that his religion spread immediately, and with inconceivable rapidity, through Judea, Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy, the most enlightened and inquiring parts of the world; and that the Christians were an innocent, forgiving, compassionate people, despising the world, adoring Christ as a God, believing even to martyrdom *his* resurrection, and assured of their own. With the heathen authorities the few Jewish writers concur as to the facts.

II. The whole series of Christian writers—and they are numerous as their works are voluminous—from the age of the apostles—of whom Barnabas and Clement were contemporaries, and Polycarp and Ignatius disciples—to the present, in treatises, apologies, and discussions, argue on the supposition of the facts being as the apostles have related, and quote their words. A comment is the collateral evidence of a pre-existing text; and early references to the Scriptures shew them to be not recent compositions.

III. The epistles, or letters of the apostles themselves, incidentally and inadvertently mention all the facts of the Gospel, and exhibit the state of the church in the earliest periods; and these correspond with what history and tradition have recorded, as well as with what reasoning might have anticipated, nor are they contradicted by any fact or conflicting narrative. These epistles were not intended as histories, or records of the facts of the Gospel, but as exhortations, and explanations of facts well known to those to whom they were addressed. They allude to all the facts as known, *stirring up the pure minds of converts by way of remembrance* (2 Peter iii. 1), and exhorting them *not to let slip the things which they HAD HEARD*, Heb. ii. 1. Doubts have been entertained as to the genuineness of the Epistle to the Hebrews; but there can be none as to

its high antiquity, for it speaks of the temple of Jerusalem as yet standing. A vindication of this epistle from the cavils of objectors—from Origen to Michaelis—has just been published by the Rev. C. Foster, chaplain to the late Bishop Jebb.

Even spurious writings of the same age acknowledge the same truths—a proof that belief in them generally prevailed. Fables were grafted thereon, but the original story remained.

IV. The religious rites and ceremonies used in the church sprang out of, or belonged to the *narrative*—chiefly baptism and the Lord's supper; and it belongs to adversaries to shew any date, later than the dawn of the Gospel, when these institutions began, or any time when they were not practised.

V. From the Gospels themselves, it appears that the story was public at the time of their writing, which was within thirty years of the facts. The Gospels were not the original cause of belief in the Christian narrative, but followed it as a record. St. John omits the account of the ascension, but writes of it as a point already known, making Christ say, *I am not YET ascended: what and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend?* &c. John speaks of many facts incidentally, as if they were already well known. The resurrection of Christ is mentioned by every Christian writer, of every description. All this evidence is prior to and independent of any inquiry into the genuineness of the sacred books, and to the reasons and testimonies by which they are supported.

89. *The relative situations of the Lake of Gennesaret, Capernaum, Gadara, and Tiberias, and the boundaries of Judea, Samaria, and Galilee.*

The *Lake of Gennesaret*, Sea of Tiberias, or Sea of Galilee, lay in *Galilee*, an oblong basin, a hundred furlongs in length, and forty in breadth: Capernaum stood at the upper, or northern point, between the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim. This was so usual a residence of our Saviour, in the house of Peter, during his public ministry, as to be called *his own city*, Matt. ix. 1; and from its position remarkably confirms the prophecy of Isaiah (Matt. iv. 13-16), *the land of Zabulon and Nephthalim have seen a great light*. Here, as we might suppose, was a custom-

house, or office for taking tribute of ships entering Galilee from the other tetrarchy, that of Trachonitis, Luke iii. 1.

Gadara is said by Josephus to be the capital of Peræa, eastward of the Lake of Tiberias, sixty furlongs from the shore. It gave name to a district stretching northward to the south-east border of the lake, where it met the country of the Gergesenes still more north-eastward; and as the sending the devils out of the demoniacs into the herd of swine was a miracle performed between the two districts, one evangelist says it was in the country of the Gergesenes (Matt. viii. 28), while according to Mark (v. 1) and Luke (viii. 26) the scene is in the land of the Gadarenes.

Tiberias, built by Herod the tetrarch in honour of Tiberius, lay on the west side of the lake, but inclining to the south, and gave name to the sea. It was utterly destroyed by an earthquake on January 1, 1837. It is mentioned John vi. 23.

Judea included the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Simeon, and part of Dan. Its boundaries were, on the east, the Dead Sea; on the south, the Stream of Egypt (Isa. xxvii. 12)—translated by the Septuagint ἕως Πινοκοροπῶν, from its vicinity to Rhinocorura—the well-known El Arish, and part of Mounts Halak and Seir, till it terminates at Zoar, the southern point of the Dead Sea, Gen. xv. 18, Josh. xv. 47, 1 Kings viii. 65. The western border of Judea was the Mediterranean, or Great Sea; and that on the north extended from Joppa, in a curved line, to Machærus (the northern point of the Dead Sea), where John the Baptist was beheaded.

Samaria was bounded by the Jordan on the east, Judea on the south, and the Mediterranean sea on the west. It contained the tribes of Ephraim and Issachar, west Manasseh, and a small portion of Asher. Its northern boundary was Mount Carmel and the river Kishon, terminating at Magdala, the south point of the sea of Galilee, and the birth-place of Mary Magdalene.

The borders of *Galilee* were, Samaria on the south, the Jordan and Sea of Galilee on the east, the Mediterranean on the west, and on the north a line drawn from Tyre to Mount Libanus, which terminates at Dan, Laish, or Cæsarea Philippi. The length of the whole country is spoken of in Scripture as

extending *from Dan to Beersheba*, Judges xx. 1, 1 Sam. iii. 20, &c., that is, from the most northern to the most southern point—as in England we say, “from the Land’s End to John o’Groat’s House.”

90. *How many classes of ministers did our Lord appoint before his resurrection, and what was the difference of their offices?*

Christ, who came *not to destroy the law, but to fulfil*, had so reverential an eye to the Mosaic economy, which his Father had prepared, as to induce him not to make any farther changes than were necessary to substitute the spirit for the letter of the law. God had appointed a church with three orders of ministers; and Christ may well be supposed to look with veneration to that platform in rearing his new structure. He appointed twelve apostles, with reference to the twelve tribe-chiefs, Luke vi. 13; and seventy others also, in allusion to the number of senators in the sanhedrim. These are mentioned in the Gospel as *the twelve* and *the seventy*, and were evidently held in different degrees of honour. The twelve were to be continually with our Lord, Mark iii. 13-15; and, after his ascension, to go forth, that they might preach, heal sicknesses, and cast out devils. The seventy were only to go before our Lord. The twelve were friends, John xv. 14, 15; the seventy, heralds. The appointment of the twelve was more solemn than that of the seventy, after whose commission the apostles continued to be called the twelve. The twelve were called apostles; the seventy, only disciples. The twelve were appointed to judge the twelve tribes, Matt. xix. 28, Luke xxii. 30, Rev. xxi. 14.

The apostolic college was recruited out of the seventy; and why should Matthias have been promoted, if he possessed the same authority before?

Thus, then, were there three distinct orders appointed in the early church: 1st, Christ himself, the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, the antitypical Aaron, the great High-priest called of God; 2d, the apostles, corresponding to the priests under the law, and ministering at the altar; and 3d, the seventy, in analogy to the Levites, as inferior ministers. When Christ

ascended into heaven, the apostles became the *ordaining* powers—that is, bishops; and they appointed deacons, who administered baptism and served tables where the public alms were distributed,—in near resemblance to the Levites of the law, or to the coadjutors of Moses in the wilderness.

91. *What did the Jews make a ceremony, on the admission of a proselyte, and what name did it bear?*

The Jews, on the admission of a proselyte, complied with the injunction of the Mosaic law, *when a stranger will sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land*, Exod. xii. 48. In that case, the new convert would become subject to the whole law, and enjoy all the privileges of the Jewish church. The Rabbis add, that a proselyte was examined and instructed in the Jewish religion; that he professed his assent to its doctrines; and was admitted to the church by circumcision, a baptism of immersion, and sacrifice.

The baptism was founded on the baptism of all the Israelites, in the cloud and sea, unto Moses; sanctioned by St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 2. On this *general* baptising, the propriety of infant baptism has been founded. Some divines think, that this Jewish baptism accompanying circumcision was a late invention, and that the baptism of John was one of the same nature as the pharisaical washing and purifying of cups.

The Jews considered every adult proselyte as resembling a new-born infant, and having a new soul; and the name given to his changed state was *παλιγγενεσία*, John iii. 5, Matt. xix. 28 [where note—in the *regeneration* is to be connected, not with *they who have followed me*, but with the succeeding words, *when the Son of man shall sit on his throne, &c.*, called by Jesus, in Luke xxii. 30, *in my kingdom*—that is, the spiritual kingdom which began, after Christ's ascension, in the first effusion of the Spirit, and will continue while the world lasts]. This fact is supposed to throw light on the conversation between Christ and Nicodemus, a master of Israel, at whose ignorance of the meaning of *παλιγγενεσία* our Saviour wonders, John iii. 10.

The bond of natural relation was now broken by proselytism — parents, children, and brethren, were held in the utmost contempt and indifference; and the Rabbis had a maxim, that a man might marry his own daughter born before he became a proselyte, or his own mother; and it was, no doubt, referring to this proselyte renunciation of kindred, and in prospect of the dangers to which confession of faith would expose his disciples, that our Saviour said, *If any man come unto me, and hate (or postpone) not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, he cannot be my disciple*, Luke xiv. 26. Other strong reasons, such as the marriage of an idolatress with a Jew, may have justified the same preference; and this principle explains the passage, *Hearken, O daughter; forget thine own people and thy father's house*, Ps. xlv. 10.

As regarded the Gospel, the above-cited strong phrases no doubt signified the duty of a man, when brought to the alternative, in the *earlier days* of Christianity, of sacrificing his own life, when necessary, for the cause of the Gospel, or of suppressing his new and firm convictions for the sake of peace with an idolatrous kindred. It can by no means be tortured into that gratification of filial rebellion against the laws of God, by disregard of parental authority, in *ordinary cases* and at the *present time*, which enthusiasts too readily adopt, with a head-strong obstinacy.

No; it was of this unnatural alienation from the nearest and dearest ties and duties of nature, taught by the Jewish doctors to their proselytes to Judaism, that our Lord spoke when he told the Pharisees, *Ye compass heaven and earth to make a proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves*, Matt. xxiii. 15. It was the Pharisaical *corban*, קרבן, the refusal of a temple-offering to the support of a father or mother, that he denounced, Mark vii. 11, 12. Tacitus, in speaking of the Jews, mentions the circumcision of proselytes, and writes — “*Nam pessimus quisque spretis religionibus patriis, tributa et stipes illuc congregabant, unde auctæ Judæorum res, et quia apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnes alios hostile odium. Separati epulis, discreti cubilibus, projectissima ad libidinem gens, alienarum concubitu abstinent,*

inter se nihil illicitum. Circumcidere genitalia instituere, ut diversitate noscantur. Transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant, nec quidquid prius imbuuntur, quam contemnere deos, exuere patriam, parentes, liberos, patres vilia habere.”—Tacitus, *Hist.* lib. 5. If the historian took his authority for these last words from Scripture, he was ignorant of Scripture idioms: for the texts, *Whoever shall not HATE father and mother, &c. is not worthy of me; Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I HATED,*—mean only, the one is preferred to the other.

92. *What places of the Old Testament answer to the synagogues of the New Testament?*

The word *synagogue* is rarely mentioned in the Old Testament, though occurring often in the New. Prideaux has ascribed the introduction of such places of worship, for the reading of the Scriptures and the expounding of the same, to Ezra; by which he explains the singular fact, that after the Babylonish captivity the Jews returned no more to idolatry, though prior to that time always prone to it. But there is reason to suppose that synagogues existed from the time of the settlement of the people in Canaan; the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple, where alone sacrifices could be offered, being too remote from the residence of the tribes for their resort thither oftener than at the three great annual festivals. As they would every where require Sabbath devotion and places of daily prayer, it is thought the synagogues were of earlier institution than Ezra, having been to the Temple as chapels to a parish church, or as parish churches to a cathedral. A synagogue was called בֵּית הַתְּפִלָּה, or *house of assembling*; and in Ps. lxxiv. 8 we read, *they have burned up all the synagogues of God in the land*, כָּל-בְּיָדֵי; and in Acts xv. 21 Moses is said to have had, *of OLD TIME, them that preached him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day*.

But if such buildings had an early existence, they must have been “few and far between” in the land, otherwise the mention of them would have been more frequent. Their place was supplied by the Levitical cities, four in each tribal district. There were also schools of the prophets, where they instructed their disciples, called “*children of the prophets* ;” and whither people

resorted on the Sabbaths and new moons, as they did to Elisha (2 Kings iv. 23), and in the captivity, to Ezekiel, chap. xx. 1. There were such schools at Bethel (2 Kings ii. 3), at Jericho (2 Kings ii. 5), and at Naioth Ramah, 1 Sam. xix. 19, 20.

But these likewise were too thinly scattered to answer the purpose of a holy convocation on the Sabbath, agreeably to Levit. xxiii. 3, *the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all YOUR DWELLINGS*, שַׁבַּת שְׁבִיתוֹן מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ.

Here *mikra* (convocation) supposes more families than one, and signifies the place of assemblage rather than the persons convened; for the word is repeated in the plural in Isaiah iv. 5, מִקְרָאֵי, where the assemblies are distinguished from Mount Zion or the temple. These, with the Levitical cities and the schools of the prophets, answer to the synagogues of the New Testament. There is no trace of the *προσευχαί*, or oratories, in the Old Testament.

93. *The criterion of a miracle applied to those wrought by Christ.*

A miracle is an event or effect contrary to the established laws of nature or course of things, wrought by the power or permission of God, to prove a doctrine, or ratify the divine mission of an individual:—to prove a doctrine, such as a future state, by the ascension of Elijah into heaven;—to ratify a man's message by the authority of God, as the mission of Moses was confirmed by the parting of the Red Sea. In the Gospel, Christ proved his power to forgive sins by the healing of the sick of the palsy, *But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then saith he to the sick of the palsy), Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house*, Matt. ix. 6. And he shewed his divine mission by raising himself from the grave, which at the same time proved the doctrine of a general resurrection. Then said the Jews unto him, *What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things* (viz. castest out the buyers and sellers)? Jesus answered, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. If ye believe not my words, believe me for the very works' sake*, John xiv. 11, v. 36, x. 38.

94. *Kingdom of God, or kingdom of heaven.*

That *the kingdom of God* and *the kingdom of heaven* have the same meaning, appears from comparing parallel passages in different evangelists. Thus the poor in spirit are promised the kingdom of heaven in Matt. v. 3, and of God in Luke vi. 20 : the kingdom of heaven, Matt. iii. 2, or of God, Mark xi. 15, is at hand. For this kingdom being created by the God of heaven, derives its name from either ; and קַדְשֵׁי, the heavens, is the name of God in Dan. iv. 26.

This phrase has two meanings — the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory. In the first sense, it is the coming of the Messiah to erect his spiritual kingdom, or the state, government, and privileges of his church, commencing with the descent of the Holy Spirit on his head at the time of his baptism, or, according to others, with the descent of the same Spirit on his apostles on the Pentecost after his ascension. In this sense, the kingdom of heaven is said, in Matt. iv. 17, Luke x. 9, to be at hand, or near, that is, was then presently to be manifested, and again, in Matt. xii. 28, Mark ix. 1, Luke xvi. 16, Matt. xxi. 43, &c. ; and in the same sense it is primarily understood in almost all the parables which speak of the kingdom of God, as in Matthew, chaps. xvi. xviii. and xxii. This is the kingdom of which the disciples knew the mysteries (Matt. xiii. 11), and from which the scribe was not far off, Mark xii. 34.

In the second sense the phrase signifies — that heavenly kingdom purchased and prepared for the faithful by Christ, and in which, as being (through grace) their recompense, they shall enjoy endless felicity with God in heaven : *Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven ; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven*, Matt. vii. 21. This is that kingdom which men are to seek above all earthly things (Luke xii. 31), and which it is the *Father's good pleasure to give*, ver. 32, Matt. xiii. 43, and many other places.

But in some passages of the Gospels both these meanings are blended, and in others it may be difficult to determine to which of the senses the words are to be referred ; as the text Matt. v. 19 may signify, either the Gospel-covenant in the present world, or the degrees of eternal reward and punishment in

the world to come; Matt. vi. 33, xix. 24, Mark x. 14, 15, 23-25, Luke xviii. 29, xxii. 29, 30.

There is likewise a sense in which the *kingdom of heaven* signifies the commencement of the heavenly enjoyment in the breast of a sincere Christian: *The kingdom of God is within you*, Luke xvii. 21; *the kingdom of heaven is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost*, Rom. xiv. 17. See a sermon by Chalmers, *Heaven a Character, and not a Locality*; and one by Bishop Jebb, serm. iv. on Rom. xiv. 17.

95. *Leading features of Jewish history from the call of Abraham to the birth of Christ, with the dates of the principal events.*

Abraham was called out of Ur in Chaldea B.C. 1921, when seventy-five years of age, and directed to go into Canaan, with a promise that his family should inherit that land, and that the Messiah should spring from his race: while of the covenant then made, circumcision was the sign. Isaac, his son, was born B.C. 1898; and Jacob, the son of Isaac, B.C. 1837. To Jacob were born twelve sons, the fathers of the twelve tribes of Israel — eleven of whom, through envy of Joseph, the youngest, his father's favourite, sold him into Egypt (B.C. 1729), where he rose to high dignity, and saved the country in a famine. Discovering himself to his brothers as they came to buy corn, he shewed a noble example of forgiveness in bringing them, with their families and their father Jacob, into Egypt, B.C. 1706, where they dwelt, and multiplied from seventy persons to 600,000. A little before this time, Job is said to have lived, B.C. 1700; and his book affords information respecting the patriarchal or ante-Mosaical religion, which contained a knowledge of typical sacrifice, the unity and spirituality of God, a redeemer, and a resurrection. The miraculous increase of the Israelites excited the jealousy of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, who directed that their male infants should be destroyed as soon as born. From this fate Moses was delivered by the daughter of that prince; and, commissioned by Jehovah, who appeared to him in a burning bush, led the Israelites out of Canaan, with

many signs and wonders, under God's mighty hand and outstretched arm, through the wilderness of Arabia Petræa, into Canaan. The date of the birth of Moses is B.C. 1571; that of the Exodus from Egypt and giving of the law, B.C. 1491; that of the death of Moses and the entrance into the promised land, B.C. 1451. Joshua, the successor of Moses, conquered the country; and after his death, B.C. 1426, thirteen judges were raised up in succession to deliver the people from their enemies—from Othniel to Samuel, during 339 years. The people clamouring for a king, and rejecting the theocracy, Saul, a Benjamite, was appointed the first king, B.C. 1095, and was succeeded by David of Judah, B.C. 1056. Solomon, his son, ascended the throne B.C. 1015; and in his son Rehoboam's reign, B.C. 975, the ten tribes rebelled under Jeroboam, and established the kingdom of Israel, of which the capital was Samaria. Nineteen kings reigned in Samaria, from Jeroboam to Hosea, in whose reign the ten tribes were carried captives into Assyria by Salmanasar, B.C. 721. Thus that kingdom lasted 254 years. In the meantime, and 133 years longer, the throne of Judah was occupied in Jerusalem by twenty monarchs, the last of whom was Zedekiah: in his reign, Nebuchadnezzar destroyed Jerusalem, B.C. 588, and carried the people to Babylon. This captivity, which is dated from a first carrying away eighteen years before, B.C. 606, lasted seventy years—the Jews being sent back by Cyrus B.C. 536. Ezra returned to restore the law B.C. 457, and Nehemiah to rebuild the city B.C. 425. The Samaritans, baffled in their attempt to join the Jews in rebuilding the Temple, erected on Mount Gerizim, near Shechem, a rival edifice, for their own worship, B.C. 408. Haggai and Zechariah beheld the second Temple in Jerusalem; and the book of prophecy closed with Malachi, B.C. 397. The Jews now shared in the contests between the Syrian and Egyptian successors of Alexander—the Seleucidæ and Ptolemies. The Septuagint translation was published under the auspices of Ptolemy Philadelphus, B.C. 291. Antiochus Epiphanes took Jerusalem and profaned the Temple B.C. 170, which was retaken by Judas Maccabeus B.C. 166. The apocryphal history closes B.C. 135: and it is from this, as supported or supplied by Josephus, that the

Jewish history is collected down to the birth of our Lord, B.C. 4—that is, before the vulgar era. Simon Maccabeus obtained the power of coining money from the Syrian prince Antiochus Sidetes B.C. 160. Pompey made Jerusalem tributary B.C. 60. Herod the great, an Edomite, was made king by Augustus B.C. 37, and began to rebuild or repair the temple on the old foundation B.C. 17.

96. *The obstinacy of the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles no objection to the truth of Christianity.*

God has given us, in the Gospel, a religion calculated to meliorate the condition of man on earth, and to advance his eternal happiness. He has proposed and offered it; but as we are his reasonable creatures, he forces it on no one. All may be saved, if they will; the means are in their power: and it is their own fault, and will be their own misery, if they neglect so great salvation.

Millions have embraced and died in the truth, and it is continually extending its influence and making fresh conquests. If the unbelieving Jews still stop their ears, and the worldly Gentiles are indifferent, this should encourage zeal to persevere in conversion, rather than be considered as disproving the truth of the Gospel.

The Jews admit all the prophecies which form the groundwork of Christianity, in the same general sense, and to the same extent, as Christians. With regard to their application to a Messiah, they only differ as to the individual indicated. May we not trust, that the judicial blindness in part which has happened, according to prophecy, unto Israel (Rom. xi. 25), will give way in the good time of God, with whom a thousand years are as one day? and that, when *the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in, all Israel shall be saved?* Rom. xi. 26. Again, it is not the object of Christianity to multiply nominal recruits, but to discipline faithful soldiers and servants of Jesus Christ: it seeks, more than geographical extension, a *peculiar people, zealous of good works*. The Gospel has been preached among many nations, and even infidels who reject it partake of its advantage and rejoice in its light; but they cannot be forced

into conversion; nor will persuasion universally and finally succeed, until the predicted fulness of the time shall have come, when there will be *one fold under one shepherd*.

As the beneficial tendency of Christianity is not a full proof of its truth, so its want of complete efficiency is no proof of its falsehood. Overwhelming evidence would leave no room for choice or moral determination. Even carrying the evidence of prophecy in one hand, and miracle in the other, the Gospel is now, as it was of old, too self-denying and soul-searching a system to prevail with Jews to part with their claims to exclusive favour with God, and with Gentiles to abandon their pleasures—the lust of the eye, the pride of life, and the love of the world.

97. *Golden number, and Sunday letter.*

The *golden number*, or lunar cycle, is a period of nineteen years, after which the new and full moons return to the same days of the month, only one hour and twenty-eight minutes sooner; so that, on whatever days of the month the new and full moons happen in any year, they will fall on the same days nineteen years thereafter—except when a centesimal common year happens within the cycle, in which case the new and full moons will come a day later in the calendar than they would have otherwise come; so that, when a centesimal year falls within the cycle of nineteen years, the golden number, instead of being March 10, will for that year be March 11. The number of years elapsed in this cycle is called the *prime*, from pointing out the day of the new moon, *primum lunæ*—or the golden number, as worthy of being written in letters of gold. The golden numbers are those placed in the first column of a calendar—betwixt 21st March and 18th April, both inclusive—to denote the days on which these *full* moons fall, which happen upon or next after 21st March in those years of which they are respectively the golden numbers. The full moon is always the fifteenth day from the new moon. This invention was called the cycle of Meton, and adopted in Greece B.C. 433.

To find the golden number of any year, add one to that year, because one year of this cycle had elapsed before the Chris-

tian era began—and divide by nineteen. The remainder is the current year of this cycle; but if there be no remainder, it is the last year, and the golden number is nineteen.

$1838 + 1 = 1839$, and $\frac{1839}{19} = 96 \frac{15}{19}$: therefore the golden number is fifteen.

The *Sunday*, or *dominical letter*, is that which points out in the calendar the Sundays throughout the year. The seven first letters of the alphabet mark the days of the week, calling the 1st of January A, and the 7th G; so that, on whatever day of the first week the Sunday happens, the course of seven letters repeated will leave the same dominical letter on all the successive Sundays throughout the year. Now, if 365 days be divided by 7, we shall have fifty-two weeks and one day over; for $\frac{365}{7} = 52 \frac{1}{7}$. Hence, on whatever day of the week the year begins, it ends the same day of the week, and the next year begins with the following day. The letter C then would mark the third day of January; and if the third day were the first Sunday, C would be the Sunday letter for that year. In this case the year would have begun on *Friday*, and would end on *Friday*: B then would be the dominical letter of the year following; for the 1st of January (always marked A) being *Saturday*, the 2d, or B, would designate the first Sunday and all the Sundays of that year.

But as every *fourth* year contains 366 days (being four times the six hours over 365 days of common years), the series of letters will be interrupted after the 24th of February, the day for throwing in the intercalary-day on every leap-year; for the 24th of February being repeated on *leap-years* (the Roman calendar—which gives them the name of *bissextile*, i. e. twice the 6th before the kalends or 1st of March), and both days being marked with the *same letter* (though we, for convenience' sake, call the additional day the 29th),—the Sunday will come a day later than it ought in a year of 365 days, and consequently will be marked with the following dominical letter to that used up to the 24th of February. Hence every bissextile year has two Sunday letters, the second beginning after the intercalary-day; and as this happens every fourth year, 4 multiplied by 7—

the number of Sunday letters and of days in the week—will give 28, the number of years, or cycle when the order of succession in dominical letters will return.

What is the dominical letter for 1838? $1838 + \frac{1838}{4} = 328\frac{1}{4}$: therefore the dominical letter for 1838 is G. From 1800 to 1899 add to the current year its fourth part, omitting fractions, and divide by 7. If there be no remainder, A is the Sunday letter; if 1 remains, it is G; if 2, F; if 3, E; if 4, D; if 5, C; if 6, B.

The golden number and Sunday letter are useful in constructing almanacks, and in ascertaining the time of Easter, on which all the movable feasts and fasts in the ecclesiastical year depend.

98. *The Septuagint.*

Aristeas, an officer of the Egyptian guards, has stated that seventy-two Jews, called the seventy interpreters as a round number, were lodged by Ptolemy Philadelphus on the isle of Pharos, and there made a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek in seventy-two days; to which Philo adds, that the separate translators collated their books, and found that they tallied in every word; and Justin Martyr, that the fathers had been shut up in separate cells. All this is exploded; and we only know for certain, that Ptolemy Philadelphus, and probably his father Ptolemy Lagus, procured a copy of the Hebrew Pentateuch, and directed that it should be translated into Greek, to enrich his library at Alexandria. The introduction of Coptic, or pure Egyptian words, and the rendering of Hebrew notions into Egyptian modes of speech, shew that the translators were not Jews sent by Eleazer the high-priest, but native Egyptians. This is particularly evident Psalm xl. 8, where, through ignorance of the Levitical custom alluded to, the phrase *mine ear hast thou opened* is rendered *a body hast thou prepared me*. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has evidently quoted not from the *Hebrew*, but the *Septuagint*, Heb. x. 5. As the earlier portions of the Septuagint are written in purer styles, it is probable that the whole was published at

different times and written by different persons: it is farther probable that the latter parts were directed to be published for the use of the many Jews naturalised in that country. The whole was an admirable plan of Providence as a preparation for the Messiah's coming into the world, by sending the Jewish Scriptures and a knowledge of divine truth into all parts of it nearly three centuries before the birth of Christ. The prophecies were thus dispersed, attention drawn to their contents; and the objection precluded, that they were invented in accommodation to the facts *after* these facts had happened, or came so near *before* the facts as to be only the speculations of uninspired sagacity.

99. *Could our Lord be charged with neglect of what the law of Moses had enjoined?*

Christ, though he came to put a spiritual construction on the law, and to blot out the handwriting of ordinances, paid strict attention to the national religion up to that moment of his crucifixion when he cried, *It is finished*. Though without sin, either original or actual, he submitted to the rites of circumcision and John's baptism; replying to the reluctant Baptist, in the latter case, *Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness*. He went into the synagogues every Sabbath-day, and kept the regular feasts at Jerusalem. He shewed, by reference to the Jewish law and practice, that it was lawful to do good on the Sabbath-day. Though Lord of the Temple, he never entered the court of the priests. He paid deference to the high-priest; and inculcated the duties of rendering unto Cæsar the homage of loyalty, and to the Temple the tribute of religious obligation.

100. *Divisions among Christians.*

Our Saviour declared, that he *came not to send peace on earth, but a sword*; which may not only signify external persecution, but the differences which he foreknew would rend his church. Apart from all pride, it must needs be that men, seriously applying themselves to so momentous a subject as that of the salvation of the soul, should take different views, in many points, of the revealed word of God as declared in the Scriptures,

and that what they hold to be truth, they should defend with zeal. But were due attention paid to the Christian temper, a sense of fallibility and a sense of charity would prevent that zeal from running into animosity and violence. In the meantime, diversities of opinion would, in the early ages, preserve the Scriptures in their purity, as each religious party would jealously watch any attempt of others to bend the sacred writings into an accommodation to their own principles.

But this, it may be said, is a contingent advantage, produced by the wisdom and goodness of God, who makes the wrath of man to praise him, and brings good out of evil. Generally, then, we observe, that our Lord's prayer for his disciples was, *That they all might be one ; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us ; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me*, John xvii. 21 : and throughout the Epistles we find continual exhortations to be *of one accord and of one mind*, Philip. ii. 2 ; *of the same mind one to another*, Rom. xii. 16 ; *with one mind and one mouth to glorify God*, Rom. xv. 6 ; to *speak the same thing, that there be no divisions* (*σχίσματα*) *among the disciples, but that they might be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment*, 1 Cor. i. 10 ; to *be of one mind and live in peace, that the God of love and peace might be with them*, 2 Cor. xiii. 11. Such passages might be multiplied.

Nor are the Scriptures less careful to condemn a contrary course ; to remonstrate against schism, as uncharitable and noxious ; as rending the seamless vesture of Christ ; as violating the united keeping of the common faith entrusted to the disciples ; and as causing *the enemies of the Gospel to blaspheme* (2 Sam. xii. 14), by arraigning the whole of that truth, concerning parts of which they find so many contending opinions. *Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul ; and I of Apollos ; and I of Cephas ; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided ? was Paul crucified for you ? or were ye baptised in the name of Paul ?* 1 Cor. i. 12, 13.

St. James points out the origin of these divisions : *From whence come wars and fightings among you ? come they not hence, even from your lusts that war in your members ?* And

another source of schism was the lust of power, displayed in the desire of establishing a sect, or ruling in a congregation, and instanced in Diotrephes, *who loved to have the pre-eminence*, and created divisions, 3 John, ver. 9. Thus passion and pride are the two great sources of schism. Impressed with a sense of these evils, and of their origin and consequences, Paul thus advises the Romans, *Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions, and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple*, Rom. xvi. 17, 18.

To ascribe such intentions to all dissenters would be uncharitable and unjust, many being conscientious, upright, and useful; but it may be doubted, whether, at the best, the rivalry of sects with the church and one another do not much impair that charity and candour which *thinketh* no evil and rejoiceth in the truth, and dispose the minds of men to take up readily any story respecting a neighbour (not only party, but individual of that party), to rejoice at his failures, and view his successes with envy.

Christ evidently intended unity in his church: he wished it to be a body, where many members should be combined in one individuality—of which he was himself the Head—and knit together in love; that each should help the other as a member of the same body; and that *from Christ the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in love*, Ephes. iv. 16.

To accomplish this desirable end, our Lord established a unity of doctrine, and left a church and a ministry as depositories of the truth—himself promising to be with them always unto the end of time: *there is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, &c.* Ephes. iv. 4-6. The exhortation deduced from this consideration is—*endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.*

On the whole, we conclude, that *it is impossible but that offences must come* (Luke xvii. 1), and that they are one of the trials of Christian professors, who may differ without parting with the Christian spirit; *but that woe unto that man by whom the offences come* (Luke xvii. 1) lightly or unnecessarily, since they are contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, and contrary to its truths; for among all the diversities of opinion there can be but one that is true.

Let not the Roman Catholic church maintain that this bears against all Protestants, who have gone from them as the church of Christ. We maintain, that in much superstition they have defaced the marks of truth from their church, though they preserve the apostolical succession and some of the Christian doctrines. We affirm that they are the heretics, and that we are not the schismatics—that we have purified true religion from their defilements, and unveiled it from their disguisings—that *we* are the church *built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone*, Ephes. ii. 20—and, in one word, addressed to them, and to *every* sect, that all schism is sin, except when it would be a greater evil and a greater sin not to separate.

101. *Purposes of our Lord's remaining on earth forty days after his resurrection, and before his ascension.*

Christ remained on earth forty days after his resurrection before he ascended, that he might give sufficient proof of that important fact—not to all the people (for there still would have been other people and other generations to take it upon the authority of testimony), but to a body of witnesses chosen before of God, first to *Cephas*, then to the twelve, then to the five hundred brethren at once, the greater part of whom remained as witnesses at the time of St. Paul's referring to their testimony, and many of whom sealed their testimony with their blood—a blood of martyrs, which became the seed of the church. In this sojourn, he removed the doubts of the disciples, and shewed that it was he himself, and not a spectral illusion. *Children, have ye any meat?* said he, and he nourished his risen body with a piece of broiled fish and a honeycomb. He broke bread with some, and con-

versed with others; and to the unbelieving Thomas he said, *Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side*, John xx. 27. Thus the evidence was not left even to one sense—hearing confirmed the testimony of sight, and touch the testimony of both; and hence St. John begins his first general Epistle—directed against the *Δοκῆται*, who had already begun to appear—*That which our hands have handled of the Word of life—that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you*, 1 John i. 1-3.

All this care was designed to qualify the apostles and other beholders to bear the truth of the resurrection to the Jews and Gentiles: *And ye are witnesses of these things*, Luke xxiv. 48. Such also was the purpose for which the Holy Ghost was sent on them, and the power of working miracles imparted: *But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be WITNESSES UNTO ME both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth*. *Μάρτυρες*, witnesses, so usually sealed their testimony with their blood, as to give rise to the word *martyr*, Acts i. 8.

Christ *personally* was appointed to return to the Father, at whose right hand he should ever live to make intercession for his disciples. He could not, then, display his risen body to all men of all generations; whose persuasion, accordingly, was to be founded in the accredited report and sincerity of those chosen few: *Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed*, John xx. 29.

102. *The Judaising Christians.*

As Christianity grew out of Judaism, the Jewish converts, called Judaising Christians, thought that converted heathens, like proselytes of righteousness, should submit to circumcision, and embrace the other rites of the Mosaic law. The apostles wished to release them from this yoke, which neither the Jews themselves nor their fathers were able to bear, assuring them that circumcision availed nothing, but that the new creature in spiritual affections was every thing—the thing signified having abolished the sign, or rather the symbol of the *καλιγγενεσία*

having been changed for another less painful, and more significant of the inward purity required. This matter was laid before a council of the apostles at Jerusalem; and they issued a rescript, enjoining such a respect for the prejudices of christianised Jews in every city, as might merely recommend abstinence from meat offered to idols, and from things strangled, and from blood, &c. Acts, xv. 29.

103. Morality of the ten commandments, as still binding on Christians as well as Jews.

Morality is a knowledge and discharge of the duties of life. Now the six last commandments (or second table), comprehensively considered in all their relations and bearings, constitute a compendium of moral duties—the fifth stretching out into all the feelings of relationship; the sixth teaching mercy; the seventh, the control of the animal passions and appetites; the eighth inculcating honesty; the ninth, truth; and the tenth keeping all these evils at a distance, and a fence around them, by forefending their first risings in the thoughts and desires. But what is the ground of moral obligation? Why should I practise these duties? Is it because human laws will punish violations of them? But human laws present an imperfect scale of duties: they do not reach the thoughts, and offer no recompense to active benevolence. Is it that I fear the censure, or covet the good opinion of men? This too is an imperfect code: it does not reach a depraved mind: it little affects the gamester, the seducer, the duellist, or the suicide. The accomplished libertine, the rich and gay infidel, the profligate wit, the minister to the pleasures of sinfulness, find their vices sunk in the splendour of their captivations. Expedience will not do; for what is false, dishonest, cruel, may be expedient. Usefulness will not do; for why should I not be selfish rather than useful? Morality has no foundation but the will of God. And why should I obey the will of God? Because he has power, and a will to reward or punish me. The first four commandments in the decalogue, then, are moral, because they are the only sound foundations of practical morality, that is, of the six last. I must know who is the true God, and what are his attri-

butes and demands, that I may serve him truly and aright : I must hold him uppermost in my thoughts, and have no idol, no competitor, no other object of worship : I must fear, honour, and reverence so great a Being, not using his very name lightly ; and as the cares, occupations, pleasures, vanities of life, are apt to divert my attention from these thoughts and devotions, I must avail myself of that stated interval of the seventh portion of my time which he hath demanded, or rather vouchsafed as a privilege, for the purpose of resting my mind from its secular concerns and toils, and recalling it to its sober views and holy purposes. Thus is the morality of the whole decalogue made out ; and surely the same reasons render it obligatory on Christians as on the ancient Jews. *Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil*—to realise it as a law of prefigurations—to spiritualise it as a law of ceremonies—to enlarge, to exalt, to purify it as a law of morals. This is the whole drift of the sermon on the mount : and when the young man, the lawyer, the ruler, asked the question, *What shall I do to inherit eternal life ?* the answer was, *Thou knowest the commandments ; keep the commandments.* Nay, Christians possess a stronger motive to observe the decalogue than the Jews had ; for to the Jews the observance was a service of hope and fear ; to the Christian it is a service of love—love of God for his own sake, and of man for God's sake. Not that the Jews were unsupplied with this motive ; for *thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart* (as thy Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor), was a maxim of the Levitical law. But the love of God in redemption affords to Christians a fresh and the highest possible inducement to a return of love—to the surrender and service of the whole heart ; a love which, in its highest perfection, casteth out fear—not the fear of offending, but the slavish fear of punishment as a motive to duty.

104. *Athanasian Creed.*

Divines are now generally agreed that the Athanasian creed was not the work of Athanasius, nor composed for some time after his death, although there is much difference and no certainty of opinion respecting the true writer and the time of

publication. Athanasius was bishop of Alexandria, having sat in the first general Council of Nice, A.D. 325, in which the Arian doctrines were condemned: and he was afterwards involved in contests and troubles in resisting the Arian heresy; but after having been twice banished, he was restored by Jovian, A.D. 363, and the Nicene creed recalled along with him. In all this time we read nothing about the Athanasian creed. Vossius, A.D. 1614, first disputed its genuineness, maintaining that it could be traced no higher than the year 600; and that it was first publicly cited as the work of Athanasius at Constantinople, A.D. 1233. Usher (*Tract. de Symbolis*) contends for its citation as the creed of Athanasius 400 years earlier, and dates it higher than A.D. 447. Quesnel ascribes it to Vigilius Tapsensis, the African, in the fifth century: but Waterland (*Hist. Athan. Creed*) has produced several reasons for assigning the composition to Hilary, Bishop of Arles, who died A.D. 367. This person had been sent by Constantius to defend Athanasius against Saturninus, A.D. 355, who prevailed on that emperor to banish him to Phrygia, where he wrote his books on the Trinity. The style of his writings corresponds with that of the Athanasian creed; and his biographer, Honoratus of Marseilles, says that he composed *An Exposition of the Creed*, which is a more proper title than that of *Creed* simply. Waterland says that about A.D. 570 it received a comment, and was recommended by the name of Athanasius before A.D. 670. It was received generally in France in the 9th, and in England in the 10th century. It was called by the ancient Church a *panoply*, and by Luther *propugnaculum symboli apostolici*. It was originally written in Latin.

105. *Heresies condemned by the creed of Athanasius.*

The Athanasian creed condemns the heresies of the Arians, Macedonians, and Apollinarians; but was principally directed against the contending opinions of the Nestorians and Eutychians.

Although the Nicene creed had used the words "begotten of the Father before all worlds," and "very God of very God," there were various shades of Arianism and Semiarianism; and

as the expressions alluded to might seem to *admit* of being tortured into some priority in the Father, and a filiation not eternal, Semiarians were found not loath to subscribe it. A creed then seemed called for, which should remove all ambiguity, by saying, the Father is eternal, the Son eternal, &c.; while it pronounced the latter perfect God and perfect man.

The *Macedonians*, under Macedonius, denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, who, they taught, was a creature, though more excellent than the angels; and the Athanasian creed expressly said he was God; which the Nicene creed had done only by implication. The *Apollinarians* (named from Apollinarius, a bishop of Laodicea), likewise early in the fourth century, ascribed to Christ a sensitive but not a rational soul, which was supplied by the Divine nature, the λόγος: and against their error was levelled the verse, *perfect God and perfect man; of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting*.

The *Nestorians* were followers of Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, who, A.D. 429, taught that there were not only two natures in Christ, but two distinct persons; that Christ was a mere man, to whom God united himself mystically and morally at the time of conception (some of the Gnostics said, at the time of baptism), but that there was no miraculous incarnation. They disallowed that Mary was θεοτόκος, substituting the word χριστοτόκος.

The author of the *Manual of Sects and Heresies of the Early Church* inclines to Nestorianism, which he seems to deny to be a heresy. The distinction is nice. Popish mottoes to images of the virgin and child, "In gremio matris sedet sapientia patris," are read with a revulsion of mind. There is a difference between divinity and deity; and the Nestorians stood on the line between the Arians on the one hand, and the Patripassians on the other. This heresy denies the miraculous conception, and is at variance not only with the prophecy, *Behold, a virgin shall conceive* (Is. vii. 14), as well as that of Gen. iii. 15, *The seed of the woman*; but to the description of Matt. i. 20, *That which is conceived—γεννηθὲν, begotten—of her is of the Holy Ghost*; and Luke i. 35, in answer to ver. 34, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee*. It is remarkable that the Society

for Promoting Christian Knowledge have quarrelled with the question in Nelson's *Festivals and Fasts*, Why is the blessed virgin called the mother of God? although the answer and the several following questions seem satisfactorily to allow and explain it. The authors and advocates of the *Oxford Tracts* seem to have the right side of this argument, and to be in this case unjustly blamed. The Christian Knowledge Society has shewn here a tendency to Nestorianism, and I think (with deference) have given way too far to the revising party.

Eutyches, a monk of Constantinople, recoiling from the real or supposed heresy of Nestorius, fell into the opposite impiety, or more grievous error, affirming that there was but one nature in Christ—the divine, which entirely swallowed up the human, as the ocean dilutes into nothing a drop of vinegar; and that Christ had nothing of the humanity but the appearance. The one made Christ a mere man; and the other, eventually, not man at all.

Thus Nestorius divided the substance, while Eutyches confounded the persons. These, with the Ebionites of the first century, who denied the divinity of Christ—the spawn of the Gnostics, and ancestors of the Socinians; the Patripassians of the second century, who alleged that the Father suffered; and the Sabellians of the third, who held the Word and Holy Ghost to be only emanations from the one God, or modes of his operation,—erred on the subject of the Trinity. The creed called Athanasian had them all in view, particularly when it said, “Neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance;” and again, “One not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh;” and again, “It is necessary to everlasting salvation, that we believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ:—God, of the substance of his Father, before all worlds; and man, of the substance of *his mother*, born in the world.

Qy.—does not this view render it likely that the Athanasian creed was published earlier than the date assigned by any of the cited writers?

The Docetæ of the first century sprang from the Gnostics and disciples of Cerinthus, whose heresy one writer (*Grier on Councils*) calls the source of all troubles that ever afflicted

God's household. They taught that Christ did not suffer or die *really*, but only in *appearance*; which occasioned the clauses in the Athanasian creed, "Christ, who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead, ascended into heaven, &c. and taking the manhood into God."

106. *Difficult expressions in the Athanasian creed.*

Bishop Burgess shewed, in reply to some Socinian ribaldry, that *incomprehensibilis*, applied to the Second Person, signifies, not bounded or contained within space. In the Latin Breviary of Salisbury the word is *immensus*; Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*. The Nicene creed had asserted that the Son is one substance (*ὁμοουσις*) with the Father: yet the Athanasian creed said, There is one Person (*ὁμοούσιος*) of the Father, and another of the Son, &c. The two creeds thus appear to be in contradiction. But this arises from the mistranslation of the Latin word *persona*, *character*, in the original Athanasian creed (*totæ tres personæ coæternæ*, &c. *Breviarium Sarisbur.*), into the word *ὁμοούσιος*. *Ὅμοουσιος* occurs but once in Scripture (Heb. i. 3), where the apostle calls Christ, with regard to his Father, *χαράκτηρ τῆς ὁμοούσιως*. Compare this with Coloss. i. 15, where Christ is called *the image of the invisible God*, *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀοράτου*, and it is evident that *εἰκὼν* answers to *χαράκτηρ*. Speaking literally, there cannot be an image of what is invisible. In fact, *image* in its literal sense, *person* in its English sense, and *substance* in a material sense, are all misleading terms. It is difficult to find better words: *reflection* and *impression* are as objectionable as *image*. *Essence*, *subsistence*, *character*, would, however, be more apt. The phrase ought to run thus: Not confounding the characters, nor dividing the essence. The difference between *ὁμοούσιος* and *ὁμοιούσιος* was connected with these inaccuracies. The Arians had slipped in the iota: the Council of Nice condemned the interpolation, declaring the *essence* of the Father and the Son to be the same. — GRIER on *Councils*, p. 42.

If Christ be the divine and human natures united in one person—if Nestorius erred in denying Mary to be the mother of

God, by contradicting the Scripture, which said (Luke i. 35), *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God,*" (although his defenders say, he was hardly used in having the charge of upholding two separate persons in the Son fastened upon him, when he only affirmed that Mary should be called the mother of him who was God) — if the Divine nature was indwelling in Jesus,—how could his want of omniscience appear, in saying, *of that day knoweth not the Son*, Mark xiii. 32; or of omnipotence, in saying, *To sit at my right hand and at my left hand is not mine to give*, Matt. xx. 23, Mark x. 40; or how could he utter such a self-disqualification as, *Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one; that is God*, Luke xviii. 19. Burnet says, that out of the intimate union of the two natures arose such a communication of names and characters as we find in the Scriptures. Christ hungered, thirsted, slept, died, rose again, and ascended into heaven in his human nature; he was in the form of God, and created all things in his divine nature. The texts alluded to may signify no more, than that his human nature only disclosed such secrets and wrought such works as were necessary to support the scheme of the Gospel; and that there might be and were times and seasons which the Father hath put in his own power, but which the Son, though as God he well knew them, was not concerned, as man, to reveal.

The last quotation, *Why callest thou me good?* was a direct assumption of divinity. There is none perfectly good but one, and that is God; but if there be reason in the epithet applied to me, thou admittest more than thou art aware of: if I am indeed that perfect goodness, I am that one, or God.

But the chief difficulty in the expressions of the Athanasian creed relates to the clauses, "Whoever will be saved must believe the whole: and whosoever holds it not pure and undefiled, shall, without doubt, perish everlastingly." Some quibblers have attempted to get over this difficulty, by affirming that both in the first and last verses of the creed it is the *Catholic* faith that is said to be necessary to salvation, and that every man may put what construction he pleases on all that intervenes. This

Bishop Burnet justly condemns, as contrary to every principle of candour, honesty, and right reasoning; since the body of the creed is an explanation of what the Catholic faith, necessary to salvation, is; and he solves the difficulty by saying, that the sentences apply to men according to the measures of their knowledge, the means of their conviction, and the circumstances of their obstinacy; that God will deal unto every man according to that he hath received. It is not meant to limit the mercies of God towards those who are under such (involuntary) darkness, as not to be able to see through this subject, or to discern and acknowledge these truths. In fine, he says that the condemnation only signifies a *liability* to damnation, which may be averted by true repentance. But we affirm that repentance must include belief in the doctrines; and therefore those called high churchmen maintain that the damnatory clauses refer to the *covenanted* mercies of God, as set forth in Scripture; and that his uncovenanted mercies are still open to those who unfortunately cannot bring their faith up to the standard of orthodox requisition, provided they are sincere in their error. For actually and scripturally, *at the name of Jesus every knee must bow* in acknowledgment of his Divinity (Phil. ii. 10), and in confession that *neither is there salvation in any other*, Acts iv. 12.

107. *Why was not the advent of Jesus Christ and its consequences more distinctly revealed in the Jewish Scriptures?*

The Jews were selected from surrounding idolatry and polytheism, as depositaries of the grand doctrine of the unity and spirituality of God. For this purpose it was necessary to insulate them by laws and usages different from those of all other people, lest they should glide into the prevalent contagion. But they were likewise chosen to preserve the prophecies respecting the Messiah—a divine person, who should be the Saviour of the world, and bring immortality to light. To disclose his divinity too distinctly, in conjunction with the circumstances of his advent, would probably have destroyed a sense of

the Divine unity in the minds of a people slow to understand, and encompassed by polytheists. The prophecies relating to him were therefore delivered in highly figurative language (suitable to the style of Oriental poetry), and in scattered gleams, at long intervals, and in slow progression, gradually becoming more and more distinct. To announce events, accompanied by reprovings and threatenings, is an office which exposes the prophet to dislike, and often places him in personal danger: and it may be wise in Providence to shelter him from a direct charge of disturbing public or private tranquillity, under some ambiguity of expression. This, be it observed, leaves an exercise for faith and speculation, which could have no place were the prophecy unequivocal. And the object is much forwarded by a twofold interpretation, when the prophecy points to a smaller event at hand, and a grander one more remote. The minor accomplishment is a platform of confidence in the Divine veracity, an earnest-penny, and supports patience in the expectation of the distant event. The Saviour is introduced in prophecy in all the splendours of royalty and trophies of conquest—with his sword girt on his thigh, and his garments rolled in blood: and although these sublime views are shaded with notices of purity, peacefulness, contempt, and rejection, such notices were overlooked by a carnally minded people; or if observed, excited a belief in two Messiahs—one suffering, and the other victorious. But if the Messiah had been represented in his true feature of lowliness, and if that alone had occupied the whole field of vision, the expectation of a deliverer would not have been kept up. At the same time there was sufficient evidence to convince the Jews; but it was rejected by their obstinacy and pride, and by their jealousy of privileges communicated to the Gentiles. Had prophecy been more ample and distinct, it would have been attributed to design and collusion. It was dictated, as it is, by the Holy Ghost, to writers who probably did not know the full meaning of their words—the object being, that when the events took place, it might be remembered that Omniscience had foretold them. This was said by our Lord with reference to his own predictions; but it may be applied to all the Old Testament prophecies. The scat-

tered nature and irregularity of prophecy is explained by observing, that the prophet often began with narrative, or reasoning, or praise, when the Spirit, at His will, hurried him away into ecstatic revelations ; and the learned Jews studied to gather up those fragments, to string and arrange them, and to apply them to the expected Messiah.

108. *How came doves and money-changers into the temple ?*

Traffic in doves, for the offerings of the temple, at the purification of women (Luke ii. 24, Levit. xii. 6), and the exchange of money to be given as alms and the half-shekel tribute, were carried on in the court of the Gentiles, and roused the indignation of the meek Jesus to overturn the tables of the *κολλυβισταί*, and to the making of a whip of cords or rushes (probably likewise sold to bind the sacrifice to the horns of the altar, Psalm cxviii. 27), with which he drove forth the profaners of his Father's house, since they had converted it into a den of thieves. Here the zeal for his Father's house protected, not only Jewish worshippers, but even the proselytes of the gate and devout Gentiles in their imperfect worship.

109. *Did the Gentiles ever worship or sacrifice in the Temple at Jerusalem ?*

The Gentiles worshipped in the Temple, but in the court of the Gentiles. They could not pass the *לִיָּח*, *chel*, or wall of partition, on pain of death. The publican who stood afar off from the Pharisee was, in all probability, a Gentile. Cornelius the centurion, who built a synagogue (Luke vii. 5), and the Ethiopian who *came up to Jerusalem for to worship* (Acts viii. 27), seem to have been proselytes of the gate. *And there were certain Greeks among them that came up to worship at the feast*, John xii. 20. This was founded in the prayer of Solomon, at the dedication of the first Temple, *Moreover concerning the stranger, which is not of thy people Israel, but is come from a far country for thy great name's sake, and thy mighty hand, and thy stretched-out arm ; if they come and pray in this house,*

then hear thou from the heavens, even from thy dwelling-place, and do according to all that the stranger calleth to thee for ; that all people of the earth may know thy name, and fear thee, as doth thy people Israel, and may know that this house which I have built is called by thy name, 2 Chron. vi. 32, 33.

Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, acquaints us that, when converted, they might offer sacrifices: *that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of God, that the offering up* (margin, "sacrificing") *of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, Rom. xv. 16, Philipp. ii. 17: this was agreeable to the prophecy of Isaiah, lxvi. 20. Προσφορά is a sacrifice, Heb. x. 10. Προσφορά is joined with θυσία in Ephes. v. 2 and Heb. x. 5, 8, by which commentators understand bloodless and bloody sacrifices, peace-offerings and sin-offerings; but Bloomfield thinks that the union of both terms shews the completeness of the sacrifice.*

110. *Crucifixion a Roman punishment; why inflicted on Christ, a Jew. Inscription on the cross.*

Crucifixion was a Roman punishment, at once the most painful and ignominious, inflicted on slaves for rebellion, robbery, and murder, who after being scourged (*sub furcā cæsi*) were affixed to a cross (*in crucem acti*), with a label or inscription on their breast (*Dio, liv. 3*); *præcedente titulo, qui causam pœnæ indiceret* (Sueton. Calig. xxxii.). This was precisely the manner in which Pilate treated Christ, whose minute prediction of it, while at a distance from Jerusalem, and of the mockery and upbraiding which accompanied it, ἐμπαῖζαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι (Matt. xx. 19), is the more astonishing, as he was much more likely to be stoned to death by a decree of the Sanhedrim, to whom Pilate had given permission to judge him according to their law (John xviii. 31), or, like St. Stephen, despatched in a popular tumult, Acts vii. 57, 58.

No doubt the Jews replied to Pilate, *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death* (John xviii. 31)—that is, for sedition, and stirring up the people, and calling himself a king, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar—the charges which they brought against him before the Roman governor, Luke xxiii.

1, 5, John xviii. 33; but it is generally agreed among commentators, that although cognisance of the *læsa majestas* belonged to the Roman procurator, the Jews had yet the power of inflicting capital punishment in sacred matters, though subject to the confirmation of the procurator. Now stoning to death was the punishment awarded by the Levitical law to blasphemy, the crime with which Jesus had been charged before the chief priest (Levit. xxiv. 16); for it was that of calling himself Christ the Son of God, and of pretending, that if the Jews would destroy the Temple, he would rebuild it in three days, Matt. xxiv. 61 and 63.

It would seem, however, that to deliver themselves from any doubt on this point, and to make sure of Pilate's sentence, the chief-priests, changing their ground, directly brought an accusation of *sedition*, driving it home with the threat, that if Pilate suffered Jesus to escape (as he was inclined to do), he was not Cæsar's friend, and might lay himself open to complaint.

The accusation over the cross was written in Hebrew (i. e. in Syro-Chaldaic) for the common people, in Latin for the Roman soldiers, and in Greek to be read by the Asiatic and Alexandrian Jews and strangers who had come to Jerusalem to keep the pass-over. But all this was done that the prophecies might be fulfilled: that of David, *ALL they that see me shoot out the lip and shake the head, saying, He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him; let him deliver him, if he delight in him* (margin), Psalm xxii. 7; see Psalm cix. 25:—that of Moses, *His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day; for he that is hanged is accursed of God*, Deut. xxi. 23:—that of Isaiah (xxv. 11), *He shall spread forth his hands in the midst of them, as he that swimmeth spreadeth forth his hands to swim* (the posture of a crucified person)—a prophecy of a Roman punishment delivered before the Roman power was known:—that of Moses, *A bone of him shall not be broken*, Exod. xii. 46;—and several others:—and finally that of our Saviour himself, *to mock, and scourge, and crucify him*, Matt. xx. 18, 19.

But many of these predictions, say the rationalists, are accommodations: yet it is remarkable that this idea was never

suggested by the Jews. By them these scriptures were understood as predictions; and their language was never, Your texts are far-fetched and distorted; but, They are all true predictions, referring to a Messiah—only this Jesus is not the man.

111. *Death of our Lord necessary, as King and Priest.*

The death of Christ was necessary in his *regal* character, as he was the King who came to his daughter of Judah, the spiritual church—to deliver her from the power of her enemies, *sin and death*—to reign till he had put all things under his feet, and made his enemies his footstool, through his death destroying him who had the power of death, Heb. ii. 14;—that he might ascend up on high a royal conqueror, and lead captivity captive. He was Messiah the Prince, who should be cut off, but not for himself—and bring in everlasting righteousness. He was a King; and to this end was he born, that by his death he might bear witness to the truth; Zech. ix. 9, Luke i. 74, Ps. cx. 1, 1 Cor. xv. 25-27, Rev. xx. 14, Ps. lxxviii. 18, Dan. ix. 24, 26, John xviii. 37. He is the King who by his death shall redeem souls, and to whom prayer shall be made continually, Ps. lxxii. 14, 15.

His death was necessary in his *priestly* office, because he was the great High-priest who, neither by the blood of goats nor of calves, but by his own blood, once offered, should put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, and obtain for us eternal redemption, Heb. ix. 11, 12, 25, 26. *Christ was a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedech*; King of Salem, or of peace, and Priest of the most high God (Heb. vi. 7);—*for ever* signifying the perpetual virtue of his one sacrifice. But he was both priest and victim; the voluntary layer-down of his own life as a ransom (Matt. xx. 28); the slain goat, whose blood sprinkled the altar; and the slayer of the goat (Levit. xvi. 15); the Lamb of God, in whom and by whom all sacrifice was consummated, and all sin taken away.

112. *Is the legal authority of the Articles and Book of Common Prayer the same, or not, with that of the canons?*

The Thirty-nine Articles and Book of Common Prayer are

part of the *statute-law* of the land, being confirmed in parliament,—the Liturgy by the several acts of uniformity in the reigns of Edward the Sixth, 2 Ed. VI. cap. 1, 5 and 6 Ed. VI. cap. 1; 2 Eliz., 1 Eliz. cap. 2; and 1 Chas. II. 13, 14, cap. 23; and the Thirty-nine Articles, though originally drawn up in convocation, being required to be subscribed and assented to by 13 Eliz. cap. 12.

The Canons of 1603 were originally prepared for the province of Canterbury, with his majesty's licence, and published, by his majesty's authority, under the great seal of England; and received two years afterwards in the province of York. They are received as the command of the supreme head of the church, but they are not incorporated in the statute-law.

113. *Achaia* (2 Cor. xi. 10), *its boundaries*.

Greece, when conquered, was divided by the Romans into two provinces—the first, Macedonia, including Macedonia, Thessalia, and Epirus; and the second, Achaia, including the Peloponnesus and Græcia Propria, or what is now called Livadia, which last is bounded on the north by Thessaly and the Aspro Potamo, anciently the Achelous; on the west, by the Mediterranean; on the south, by the Gulf of Lepanto, or Bay of Corinth, with the isthmus; and on the east, by the Ægean Sea, or Archipelago.

Achaia Propria was the northern district of Peloponnesus, bounded on the north by the Bay of Corinth; on the east, by the Saronicus Sinus, or Gulf of Ægina; on the west, by the Mediterranean; and on the south, by the river Larissus (now Kamenitza), Mount Cyllene (now Mount Zyria), and Argolis.

St. Paul boasted, that in preaching the Gospel in Corinth, where he had resided a year and a half, he had been burdensome or chargeable to no citizen—partly because he worked with Aquila and Priscilla at their trade of tent-making, and partly because the brethren from Macedonia supplied what was lacking to him.

Now, although it is probable, though not quite certain, that the Achaia mentioned in Acts xviii. 12, of which Gallio was deputy, is to be understood as the latter or smaller district, of

which Corinth was then the principal city; yet in almost all the other passages wherein the word occurs, and particularly in 2 Cor. xi. 10, the whole Roman province is decidedly meant. For, first, it is opposed to Macedonia, the other province; and what could St. Paul mean by *all the regions of Achaia*, τοῖς ἐλίμασι, seeing that Corinth and its little sea-port of Cenchrea were the only places he visited? In Romans xv. 26, the contribution was made by the people of the two provinces of Macedonia and Achaia; and so, in 2 Cor. ix. 2, and 1 Thess. i. 7, 8, Paul promises the Corinthians that he will visit them when he passes through Macedonia: so that he includes their city in the *province* of Achaia, or he would have said, When I pass through Macedonia and Achaia; 1 Cor. xvi. 5.

There may be some doubts indeed about Stephanas and Epænetus as the first-fruits of Achaia the province (1 Cor. xvi. 15, Rom. xvi. 5), because Dionysius the Areopagite and Damaris were converted in Athens before them.

114. "*We are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand.*" *What peculiarity of the Hebrew language is here exemplified?*

This passage illustrates the Hebrew peculiarity of parallelism, so beautifully explained by Bishop Lowth in regard to the Old Testament, and with not less ingenuity by Bishop Jebb as to the New.

Parallelism is a metrical and mutual relationship, or balancing, between two members of a period, by which the one is an echo to the other, either repeating the same meaning in different words, or, more commonly and beautifully, some improvement in that meaning. *E.g.*:—*O go your ways into his courts with thanksgiving, and into his gates with praise. Let the wicked man forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts. My soul (ψυχή) doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit (πνεῦμα) hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.* In passages set to music, this is connected with the ἀντιφωνία, or *anthem*, in which one part of a choir responds to the other.

115. *The sanhedrim, or great council, &c.*

The sanhedrim (from the Greek συνέδριον) was the great council of the Jews, consisting of seventy, or, according to some, seventy-one, seventy-two, or seventy-three men of eminence, who determined matters of importance in church and state, and were a court of appeal from the lesser sanhedrim of twenty-three judges, as that was from the synagogue, or court of three. The word συνέδριον occurs in Matthew (v. 22), and Acts (v. 21), and is in both instances translated "council." The chief of this assembly was called נָשִׂיא or *prince*; and his deputy אֲבִי אֵת הַבֵּית דִּין or *father of the house of judgment*, whose sub-deputy was חֹכֵם the *wise*. The rest were called זִקְנִים *zekenim*, elders or senators. The deputy sat on the right hand of the prince, on a lower seat,—which illustrates Matthew (xxvi. 64), *sitting on the right hand of power*,—and the rest of the sanhedrim took their places in a semicircle on a level with the deputy. Scribes and wise men, who were candidates for vacancies in the sanhedrim, sat lower still and within the semicircle; and *disciples* sat beneath. Hence our Lord was found in the *midst* of the doctors; and St. Paul says he was educated at the *feet* of Gamaliel.

The members of the sanhedrim were "*chief priests, scribes, and elders.*" The first were the heads of the twenty-four courses of priests instituted by David, and revived after the captivity by Ezra,—and were one-third of the whole number: the second, the scribes, were doctors or teachers of the law: and the third were the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel,—making together the other two-thirds of the number. They were required to be wise, upright, of mature age, and married men, that they might be compassionate. Their time of assembling was from the morning to the evening sacrifice—from nine to three. They met in the hall, אֵת הַבֵּית, a rotunda at the south-east corner of the court of the priests, built half within the temple and half without—the sanhedrim sitting in the latter part, as no one except the king could sit within the court of the priests; and even he barely within—at the entrance. Here they assembled on the morning of the crucifixion, and resolved on delivering Jesus to Pilate;

and on their subsequent refusal to parley with Judas, he cast the betrayal money down in the temple, no doubt in the court of the Israelites, near the treasure-chests, Matt. xxvii. 1-3.

The rabbins date the establishment of the sanhedrim from the appointment of seventy-two counsellors, six out of each tribe, to assist Moses in the wilderness, Numb. xi. 16. The learned, however, fix its establishment nearly about the time of the Maccabees. Lightfoot, who dates the rise of the sanhedrim from the end of the captivity, gives a list of sixteen presidents, from Ezra to the time of Paul.

116. *Illustrate Luke v. 19, by describing a Jewish house.*

The eastern houses are built in the form of an open quadrangle, entering from a porch (θύρα), beyond which strangers are seldom permitted to pass. There are usually covered galleries all round, like some of the old inns in London, *e.g.* the Tabard or Chaucer's inn in the Borough; and the roofs are flat, with a parapet, and paved with tiles or plaster, whereon persons dry linen or flax (Josh. ii. 6); enjoy the cool of the evening in conversation (Luke xii. 3); or sleep at night, or retire at noon to pray (Acts x. 9); or lounge in idle meditation (2 Sam. xi. 2); and here of old the booths were constructed for the feast of tabernacles (Nehem. viii. 16).

The roofs being flat, it is possible to pass in a continued walk from one to another; and the staircase is on the outside, so that one may descend into the street at the end of it, or in any part, or ascend thither, without passing through the house; which explains Matthew (xxiv. 17), *Let him that is on the house-top not come down to take any thing that is in the house.* In Luke (v. 19), the persons who brought the paralytic on his κράββατος, mattress, or mean couch (whence our word *crib*), being unable to enter by the porch or door, where there was no room to receive four bearers of a litter, by reason of the press (Mark ii. 4), or multitude (Luke v. 19), carried the patient up by some adjoining staircase, till they came to the roof, ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα, of the house where Jesus was.

The commentators generally assume that our Lord was

teaching the people, or some of them, in the open court—the *impluvium*—on this occasion; and that the *στέγη* which they uncovered was an awning spread over the court as a screen in warm weather. But there would have been great difficulty and danger in letting down the bed into the open court: nor can this be reconciled to the *διὰ τῶν κεράμων* of St. Luke, *through the tiles*, or to the *ἐξορύξαντες*, *digging* or *tearing them up*, of St. Mark. And as the upper rooms in these houses were the principal apartments, we have only to place our Lord in one of these, to see how easily the litter could be let down. In such an upper room Paul was preaching at Troas, when Eutychus, being at the window, and overcome with sleep, fell from the third loft, stage, or floor, into the quadrangle, Acts xx. 9.

117. *Καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκε κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, Eph. i. 22. *Are there any Hebraisms in this passage?*

In Ephesians i. 22, *and gave him to be the head of the church*, *ἔδωκε* is put for *τίθεικε*, by a Hebraism, as the verb *יָצַק* signifies *to give* and *to appoint*. There is a redundancy in the repetition of *ὑπό* as a prefix and a separate preposition, which is also Hebraistic.

118. *Twofold promise to Abraham.*

God in calling Abraham out of Ur in Chaldaea, sent him into the land of Canaan for an inheritance, to which he proceeded by faith in God's promise, not knowing whither he went, and found on his arrival that that promised land was preoccupied by the idolatrous Canaanites, Heb. xi. 8, 9, Gen. xii. 6. This part of the promise refers to the temporal state and prosperity of his seed or family in that country, under the worship of the one true God. The second part of the promise was spiritual, viz. that *in his posterity all the nations of the earth should be blessed*: and this twofold promise was, twenty-three years afterwards, confirmed by a covenant, of which the sign was circumcision, B.C. 1893.

The descendants of Abraham—first by their idolatry, and secondly by their other sins—forfeited all claim to the former

part of this covenant; and after possessing the land of promise to the full extent promised by God, even to the river Euphrates (Gen. xv. 18, Exod. xxiii. 31, Deut. xi. 24, Josh. i. 4), as accomplished in the days of Solomon (1 Kings iv. 21, Ps. lxxii. 8), were driven out. Moses, indeed, confined his understanding of the promise to the lines from Gaza to Sidon in length, and from the same point to the Dead Sea in breadth, to Admah, &c. and Lasha,—which last city is called by Josephus *Callirrhoe*, on account of its hot springs; and is said by D'Anville to be south of Machærus, on the Lake Asphaltites, vol. i. p. 426. But whether we take the larger or smaller territory, we know that after inheriting the fulfilment of the promise to its full, and perhaps more than its understood extent (Gen. x. 19, xiii. 14, 15, xvii. 8, xxiv. 7, Numb. xxxiv. 12, Deut. xxxiv. 4, 2 Chron. xx. 7), they were first carried from their land to Babylon, and afterwards dispersed, at the destruction of their city and temple, over all the earth. But *God is not a man, that he should lie* (Numb. xxiii. 19); *His promise is without repentance, yea and amen* (Rom. xi. 29, 2 Cor. i. 20): and as the Jews and Arabians, the immediate descendants of Abraham by Isaac and Ishmael, remain unchanged as distinct nations (in the case of the Jews a miracle, since they retain their features as well as their customs in their dispersion), we doubt not that the exclusion from the land of promise is temporary, probationary, and conditional, and that they will one day repossess that land, as the Arabs have ever retained theirs. But this must be on their conversion, and returning to that Gospel, to the rejection of which they owe their sorrows, and to that Saviour whom their fathers crucified, and they themselves still crucify afresh. Many, indeed, deny a literal restoration, and say the promise belongs to the spiritual Israel; but we answer them with the distinguishing text, *Blindness in part hath happened unto Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved*, Rom. xi. 25, 26.

This brings us to the second branch of the covenant—the spiritual promise—the extension of the blessings of Christianity to all nations; which was fulfilled in part in the age of the apostles by the preaching of the Gospel of the kingdom to the then

known world, and is now in the daily course and progress of fuller accomplishment by the zeal of the charitable and the labours of the devoted: so that the happy era is almost within our grasp or sight, when the knowledge of the true God shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, Isa. xi. 9, Habbak. ii. 14.

119. *Arrange the four greater prophets in chronological order, and state the circumstances under which their prophecies were delivered.*

Isaiah, B.C. 759, to Judah and Israel.

Jeremiah, — 610, to Judah.

Ezekiel, — 599, to Judah.

Daniel, — 580, to the East, Babylon and Persia, in the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar to that of Darius the Mede, B.C. 538.

I. *Isaiah* prophesied during the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, from B.C. 758 to B.C. 726, that is, while God was preparing a terrible blow for the kingdom of Israel, which should serve as a warning to Judah, its sister. Isaiah is called by several of the Fathers the evangelical prophet; and Jerome says, that the seraph who touched his lips with fire conveyed him to the New Testament. He pursues the history of the Messiah, from his not abhorring the virgin's womb, to that glorious period when all flesh shall come to worship before him, Isa. vii. 14, lxvi. 20-23.

Isaiah was invested with the power of working miracles, 2 Kings xx. 11, 7. He prophesied the Babylonish captivity, B.C. 712, to Hezekiah, 124 years before that event, B.C. 588, when no sagacity could have anticipated it in its particulars, and no monarch could have bribed him. He prophesied the return under the auspices of Cyrus, whom he names (Isa. xlv. 28), B.C. 712, 182 years before that monarch was born. From the thirteenth chapter to the twenty-fifth, he speaks concerning the fate of the Moabites, Philistines, Syrians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, Edomites, Tyrians, and Babylonians. From the first chapter to the thirteenth, the Jews, Ishmaelites, and Babylonians, fill the field of his vision; and he returns to the Jews from the

thirty-sixth to the fortieth chapter: the remainder proclaiming the triumph of the Messiah's kingdom, the glory of which had previously burst forth in gleams.

His style unites sublimity with sweetness; and from him the Sibylline books were manifest plagiarisms. The Greek version bears marks of being translated long after the Pentateuch. The eighty-ninth Psalm is ascribed to him, composed on the approach of Rezin and Pekah to Jerusalem.

II. *Jeremiah* was a native of Anathoth, three miles northward from Jerusalem, where, during forty years, and in the reigns of the four last kings of Judah, he revealed the approaching vengeance to that devoted metropolis. When its fate was sealed, Nebuchadnezzar permitted him to remain in his native village. Here, with the ruined city in full view, he composed his celebrated *Lamentations*, of which Lowth (father of the bishop) writes: "One would conceive every letter written with a tear, and every word the sound of a broken heart." Jerusalem, the daughter of Zion, is here introduced as a widow, sitting pensive and solitary, bewailing her faded beauty and her fallen grandeur; which probably gave the hint to the artists who formed the coins of Vespasian; and certainly to Bishop Heber, in the introduction to his poem of *Palestine*—

Reft of thy sons, amid thy foes forlorn,
Mourn, widow'd queen—forgotten Zion, mourn.

Jeremiah was afterwards carried into Egypt by Johanan, one of Nebuchadnezzar's captains; and here, in Tahpahnès (or Daphne Pelusiæ, Jer. xliii. 8, 9), he dictated to Baruch the scribe, his disciple and amanuensis, prophecies respecting Egypt and Babylon, glancing also at the Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, and Elamites.

The style of Jeremiah is beautiful and tender, abounding in metaphors and poetical images, and chiefly characterised by symbolical representations of things existing or predicted. The last chapter, the fifty-second, was added after the time of Jeremiah—probably by Ezra. Jeremiah foretells the preservation of the Jews in their dispersion after the destruction of all their enemies. He foretells the happiness of the Messiah's times—the miraculous conception of Christ—the virtue of the atone-

ment, and spirituality of the Gospel-covenant—the peace, the security of the church—the spread of religious knowledge—and the perpetual duration of all these blessings, in chapters xxx., xxxi., and xxxiii. He likewise foretells the return from the eastern captivity in seventy years; and by purchasing a field in the conquered country shews his confidence in the prediction, Jer. xxiii. 11, 12. Seventy years of captivity were equivalent to the neglected Sabbatical years from the time of Saul to the Babylonish abduction, or 490 years.

III. *Ezekiel* was carried away captive to Babylon with Jehoiachin, king of Judah (the same as Jechoniah or Coniah), B.C. 606, together with Daniel, and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego,—the date of the commencement of the seventy years, though eighteen years before the general captivity. He was placed on the banks of the river Chebar in Mesopotamia—the 'Αβόρρας of Strabo, Χαβόρας of Ptolemy, and Al Chabur of the Arabs, and falsely called the Araxes by Xenophon in the *Anabasis*—which flows into the east side of the Euphrates at Circesium or Carchemish, two hundred miles to the north of Babylon; 2 Chron. xxxvi., Dan. i. 1, 2, Jer. xxix. 10. In the fifth year of his captivity he began to prophesy (Ezek. i. 1, 2), and continued in that ministry twenty years, to the fourteenth year after the first destruction of Jerusalem. Jeremiah had foretold that Zedekiah should be carried into Babylon, and Ezekiel, that he should not see that city; which contradictions were reconciled by the putting out of his eyes at Riblah, Jer. xxxii. 5, xxxiv. 3, Ezek. xii. 13, 2 Kings xxv. 6, 7.

In his exile, Ezekiel consoled the despondence of his contemporaries, who came to visit and consult him, at the same time reproving them for their past idolatries. He delivers a number of symbolical prophecies, interspersed with announcements of the total apostacy of the Jews and final destruction of their city and temple, of the advent of the Messiah, and of the ultimate restoration of the people to their own land. These prophecies are mysterious and obscure in their nature. He foretells the ruin of Tyre and Sidon (ch. xxvi. 27, 28); the utter fall of Egypt (chaps. xxix. and xxx.); and the then approaching destruction of the Moabites, Ammonites, and Philistines. The

last nine chapters contain a vision of a temple, in which a future universal church is shadowed.

The style of Ezekiel is vehement and tragical. He has been compared to the Greek Eschylus; and it is thought, that from him Pythagoras derived his knowledge of the Mosaic law.

Ezekiel prophesies and teaches by many symbolical *actions*. His prophecy concerning Tyre has often been quoted. It was then chiefly a rising city in an island, separated (afterwards by a mole) from the mainland, or Palæ-Tyrus, the old city, destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar B.C. 571. Tyre abounded in wealth, and its merchants were princes: and yet Ezekiel (whose prophecies spoke of two destructions, and related both to Palæ-Tyrus and to insular Tyre), predicted that God would scrape it as the top of a rock, making it a place for fishermen to dry their nets; and this is now literally fulfilled.

IV. The last of the four greater prophets is *Daniel*, who was carried into captivity at the same time with Ezekiel. His prophecies are cited as his own collection and production, in the New Testament (Matt. xxiv. 15, Mark xiii. 14), and formed an unquestionable part of the Hebrew canon. In the time of Josephus, Daniel was numbered with the greater prophets; but so clearly does he speak of the time when the Messiah should be cut off, that the Jews have sought pretences for classing his book among apocryphal writings. Even infidels have been galled with the extraordinary prediction of seventy weeks of years; and Porphyry attempted to shew the prophecy to have been written after the event, but this was a signal failure. Daniel's wisdom occasioned his being selected to be an attendant in the court of Babylon; and thus the prophecy addressed to Hezekiah was fulfilled, that his issue (for Daniel was of the blood-royal) should be eunuchs (courtiers, household guards) in the palace of the king of Babylon, 2 Kings xx. 18, Isa. xxxix. 6, 7.

Daniel's style is not so poetical as that of the other greater prophets, but is that of elegant historical narrative; and though the dreams and visions are symbolical, the explanation is without obscurity. As an internal evidence of genuineness, that part of the book which relates to Babylon (from chap. ii. 4 to end of

chap. vii.) is written in the Chaldee language ; and all the rest is pure Hebrew. In the midst of a court, and surrounded by temptation both of danger and allurements, Daniel found leisure from the business of state to offer private worship three times every day, agreeably to the words of David (Ps. lv. 17), evening, morning, and noon, and at the open windows of his kiosk,* not fearing to confess his God before men, Matt. x. 32. The envious nobles made this a pretence to work his ruin ; but it only ended in his higher exaltation ; and he continued a favourite during a change of dynasties, while the five successive monarchs, Nebuchadnezzar, Evil Merodach, Nereglissar, Labersachod, and Belshazzar, occupied the throne ; till Cyrus, at the appointed time, liberated his countrymen. This was in the third year of Cyrus ; for it was his father-in-law Cambyses, called Darius the Mede, who took Babylon, and was the first king, when Daniel was ninety years old. We pass by the well-known account of his deliverance from the den of lions, and that of his three companions from the fiery furnace. The second chapter relates his discovery of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which that king had forgotten, and his clear interpretation of it, as signifying, by the image with head of gold, breast of silver, belly of brass, legs of iron, and feet of iron and clay, the Assyrian, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman monarchies ; and the stone cut out without hands, which broke in pieces the image, and became a great mountain—as the Gospel, the kingdom of truth and perpetuity, which grew out of the Roman empire, and prevailed over the earth. We may likewise notice Daniel's interpretation of the terrific hand-writing on the wall, which alarmed Belshazzar amidst his impious feast, and brought his kingdom to an end ; Daniel's own vision of the four beasts, the last having ten horns and a little horn, speaking great words against the Most High, which is the papal power, growing out of one of the ten kingdoms of the Roman empire ; and his other vision of the ram with two horns, or the Median and Persian empire ; and the goat, or Macedonian monarchy,†

* See plate to Scripture Illustrations, Cant. viii. 10.

† A horn was the well-known symbol of power. A ram was the symbol of Persia, as is seen on coins and the ruins of Persepolis : and the illustrator

broken into four horns (Dan. viii. 8, 20, 21), the four successors of Alexander the Great; and another little horn;—all accompanied by calculations of time tallying with those of the Apocalypse. This latter prophecy continues 2300 *days*, which some take literally as nearly six years, the period of the hostility of Antiochus to the Jews; but others, holding the prophetic days to be years, and counting forward from 334 years before Christ, apply it to the millennium, or Sabbatarian chiliad, after the world shall have lasted 6000 years, a 1000 for each day of creation. But if the Samaritan or Septuagint computation be admitted, the 6000 years are already past; see Prof. Lee, Hale, and *Millennarianism Unscriptural*. The notion, indeed, is a conceit founded on the figurative phrase, that *a thousand years are with God as one day*, 2 Pet. iii. 8. The little horn of chap. vii. 8, xx. 21, is the popish dominion; the little horn of chap. viii. 9 is Antiochus Epiphanes. The kingdom of the Gospel, and the hostility it should sustain from the Roman power, are here foreshewn: but the grand prophecy of Daniel was that which fixed the time of seventy weeks of years, after which the Messiah should be cut off, but not for himself, and bring in everlasting righteousness, Dan. ix. 24 to end.

120. *The Articles of the Church in four general divisions.*

Of the Thirty-nine Articles, as arranged under four divisions,—I. the first five contain the Christian doctrines concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; II. the sixth, seventh, and eighth, establish the rule of faith; III. the next ten relate to Christians as individuals; IV. and the remaining twenty-one relate to them as members of a religious society.—*TOMLINE'S Elements*, vol. ii. p. 36.

of Calmet, and eastern travellers, exhibit rams with *unequal horns*—the *Medo-Persian* empire; Dan. viii. 3. A goat is known to have been the symbol of the Macedonian monarchy (Justin, *Hist.* i. 8), from Caraunus, its founder, led by goats to Ægos-Potamos, or the river of goats; Dan. viii. 5: and four-horned goats are represented as a breed remaining in the East; Dan. viii. 8. —*Taylor's* edit. of *Wells*, and *Sir W. Ouseley* and *Porter's Travels*.

121. *The Church of England and the Church of Rome compared.*

The essential points of difference between the Church of England and that of Rome relate,—I. To the number of the *sacraments*. The Romish church holds seven of these: the English church affirms that Christ only appointed two, and defies its adversaries to produce authority for more, answering to an outward sign of an inward grace, appointed by Christ himself, to be a pledge of justification and a means of sanctification,—as are, *Go and baptize* (Matt. xxviii. 19, iii. 11, Mark xvi. 16), and *This do in remembrance of me*, Luke xxii. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 25.

II. Again, the Romish church holds an actual *transubstantiation* of the sacramental bread and wine into the real body and blood of Christ: the English church affirming that Christ suffered but *once*, and dieth no more; that transubstantiation destroys the nature of a sacrament, as a thing cannot be a sign or pledge of itself; and that the Saviour's body and blood are only spiritually discerned by *faith* in the Lord's supper—faith which appropriates the benefits conferred; according to the words, *I am the bread of life: he that cometh unto me*, or believeth in me, *shall never hunger*. We explain, *This is my body*, as—this *signifies* my body; and put together the texts, *Except ye eat THE FLESH of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you: with He that BELIEVETH on me hath everlasting life*, John vi. 47, 53.

III. The Romish church, farther, refuses communion in both kinds to the laity, and elevates the host or wafer to be adored: the English church calls the former usage *injustice*, and the latter *idolatry*. The first is injustice; for, *drink ye ALL of it*, was particularly said with reference to the cup; and *as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death until he come* (1 Cor. xi. 26), was written to laymen: so that the Romanists trifle in saying the body contains the blood, and affirming that laymen were not present at the original institution. The twelve were not then commissioned by ordination and the Holy Ghost. The other usage is idolatry: this is a corollary from the former; for worship is not offered to any symbol, emblem, or representa-

tion of Divinity. It is worshipping the creature rather than the Creator (Rom. v. 25); and a direct violation of the second commandment, as quoted by our Saviour, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him ONLY shalt thou serve*, Luke iv. 8.

IV. The next point of essential difference between the two churches relates to *justification*, to a share in which the Romanists admit what they term *efficacious* works, and even *supererogatory* works—in contradiction to the English church doctrine of justification by *faith* only. In the language of an early reformer, justification by faith is the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*. The *just shall live by faith*, Heb. ii. 4; *faith which worketh by love* (Gal. v. 6) being the test of SINCERE faith; *Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved*, Acts xvi. 31; *neither is there salvation in any other*, Acts iv. 12; *only we must believe with all the heart*, Acts ix. 37, Rom. x. 9, 10.

V. The Romanists keep the Scriptures from the common people, offer prayer in a foreign language, and place reliance on unwritten traditions: the church of England prays in English, distributes the Bible, and rejects unproved tradition. *If I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful*, 1 Cor. xiv. 14, and vers. 8-20; and at the uncertain sound of the trumpet, who shall prepare himself to the battle? ver. 8. As to the Bible, we obey Him who commanded *all* to search the Scriptures as the records of eternal life, John v. 39. Timothy is commended for having studied the Scriptures from a child, 2 Tim. iii. 13, and the Bereans for their diligent investigation of the sacred volume, Acts xvii. 11; while the brethren of the rich man are blamed for not searching it, Luke xvi. 31. Unproved traditions are rejected on the authority of Matthew (xv. 9), *in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*; and of Gal. i. 8, 9, *though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed*. Holy Scripture contains *all* things necessary to salvation; for it is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, and perfecting the man of God, 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17; and although we believe that every church has power to ordain rites and ceremonies to be practised, and articles to

be believed, if not contrary to Scripture, yet nothing but what is clearly in Scripture is to be believed as necessary to salvation.

VI. Romanism professes to believe in purgatory, whereby sinners are cleansed after death; and it has masses, to pray the soul out of that imaginary state. The English church believes in an intermediate state of the conscious soul between death and the resurrection, but thinks that the tree lies as it falls, Eccles. xi. 3; that purgatory is a vain conceit; and that there is no device in the grave, Eccles. ix. 10; no place for effectual repentance, Heb. xii. 17—(margin, *no way to change the mind*); no second probation, no posthumous accepted time, 2 Cor. vi. 2. It thinks that the phrases in the Old Testament, *The dead cannot praise thee*, Ps. cxv. 17; *His breath goeth out, and then his thoughts perish*, Ps. cxlvi. 4; &c.,—signify, and were understood by the Jews to signify, no annihilation but that of the opportunities of repentance. Consequently, it holds masses for departed souls to be unscriptural.

VII. The Romish worship of angels, saints, images, relics, and the virgin, is held by the English church to be idolatrous. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, Luke iv. 8. *Let no man beguile you of your reward, by a voluntary humility in worshipping of angels*. And though all generations shall call the Virgin *blessed* (Luke i. 28, 42, 48), there is no authority for worshipping her. Though honoured, she is a creature; and our Saviour himself rebuked her, John ii. 4. Paul and Barnabas refused an offered worship (Acts xiv. 15); and so did the angel in the apocalypse, Rev. i. 16; but so did not our Lord, Matt. ii. 11, xv. 25, Luke xvii. 18.

VIII. Unconditional absolution after auricular confession, the English church condemns; for, though we are to confess our sins one to another (James v. 16), it is for comfort, not human absolution; since who can forgive sins but the Searcher of hearts? Mark ii. 7, Luke v. 21. To this point belongs the Romish sale of indulgences—which produced the Reformation.

The general principle on which Protestantism differs from Popery is spirituality. *Ye turn again to weak and beggarly*

elements, whereunto ye desire to be again in bondage ; ye observe days and months and times and years, Gal. iv. 9, 10. Not that these things are to be omitted, but used with reference to the heart ; for *he* is no more a Christian than *he* is a Jew who is one outwardly ; and baptism, as well as circumcision, is not in the letter, but in the spirit and in the heart, Rom. ii. 29. The Gospel spiritualises every thing in the law :—the Red Sea is a passage through Christ—the *way* ; the manna is the bread from above ; the rock of Horeb is the living water ; the scape-goat is He who became a curse for us ; the serpent is He to whom we are to look and be saved ; the cities of refuge are the hope set before us ; the rent vail of the temple is his flesh ; the *chel* is the abolition of the distinction between Jew and Gentile ; and Canaan is heaven. *Christ our passover is sacrificed for us : therefore let us keep the feast with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth*, 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. Two rites only are reserved as sacraments ; the one to unite us to Christ, the other to preserve the union ; and even these have an inward and spiritual meaning. But Romanism, like Phariseeism, restores the system of externals, and associates merit or demerit with the observance or neglect of them. Its religion is made up of bead-rolls, ave-Marias, and pater-nosters, self-crossings, genuflexions, holy-water sprinklings, confessions, processions, penances, fastings, relic-worshipping, pilgrimages, shrine-devotion—in short, whatever makes a fair *shew in the flesh* ; with all the pomp of music, painting, sculpture, gilding, and architecture. But, through all these externals, we look in vain for its *spiritual* approach to the God who is a Spirit—its silent and secret devotion of the soul. It is occupied too much about the signs, to be concerned about the things signified. Its churches are opera-houses and picture-galleries : its liturgies convey no idea of evangelical simplicity and sincerity. Not but that Popery grazes the heart—it takes hold of the affections as an impulse, but a transient impulse ; not a guide influencing the conduct—not a life-giving principle. An infidel writes of the religion of Italy (and every traveller knows it to be true), “Religion here pervades the whole frame of society, and is, according to the temper of individuals, a passion, a persuasion, an excuse, a refuge, *but never a check*”—(*Preface*

to SHELLEY'S *Cenci*). Protestantism rends the heart, and not the garment; its fasts are—to deal its bread to the hungry: and while it practises prescribed rites, it thinks they are nothing without the disposition of mind—that is, *without spirituality*; Joel ii. 13, Isa. lviii. 5.

122. *The darkness at the crucifixion.*

It is generally agreed, that the darkness at the crucifixion overspread only the land of Judea, or country round Jerusalem; $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \gamma\eta\nu$ being also used in Luke (iv. 25) with no more extensive signification; and the alleged heathen accounts of a darkness over the whole world being suspicious. As to the darkness, it could not have been occasioned by an eclipse of the sun; for that can only happen when the moon is new, and at the passover the moon was full; neither does the darkness of an eclipse last three hours. Some ascribe the darkness to a dense haze, such as precedes earthquakes; and confirm this view by Matt. xxvii. 51, $\gamma\eta\ \epsilon\iota\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\eta$. Naturalists say that such a phenomenon would extend to a semi-diameter of ten miles from any spot; and the darkness at the crucifixion is not said to have been total. Both the darkness and the earthquake may be regarded as preternatural. But if it were a natural haze, it would not be the less miraculous; its happening at the very time of the crucifixion,—the two facts coming together,—being in fact the miracle, and shewing the finger of God.

123. *Calvin, Luther, Arminius.*

The doctrines of Calvin are digested under five heads, called the five points—the opposite of which are held by the Arminians.

CALVINISM.

I. Absolute predestination and unconditional, with *predetermined* præterition of the reprobate.

ARMINIANISM.

I. Predestination upon foreknowledge of the party's acceptance of the Gospel-covenant, and an assertion that nothing is said in Scripture concerning *predestination to death*. Again, all the passages respecting election

II. Partial redemption—death of Christ for the elect only.

III. The total and entire depravation of man.

IV. Involuntary conversion at the *time* of God.

V. Indefectible perseverance in grace given.

are written to, or concerning, *communities*.*

II. Redemption universal in the intention and design of God, *who will have all men to be saved*, (1 Tim. ii. 4), and is *not willing that any should perish*, 2 Peter iii. 9.

III. A sufficient exception from *entire* depravation to accept or reject grace given, as answering to the word "will" in the article, to *our spirits witnessing with his Spirit*, in Scripture, and to the good ground on which the seed is sown, in the parable, Rom. viii. 16, and Luke viii. 15.

IV. Conversion in a Christian land and age *at any time*, because the grace which produces it is always an open fountain, and only requires the sinner, under the ordinary aids of grace, to bring his pitcher and to draw. *This day—every, any day—is the day of salvation*, 2 Cor. vi. 2. *Repent, and be converted* (Acts iii. 19), is an invitation to co-operate, not a decree for compulsion, or to deal with man as a machine. *Why WILL ye die?* (Jer. xxvii. 13) is a call of grace to the moral agent.

V. Wholly denied, on the authority of Heb. x. 38, *if HE* (the just—not *any man*) *draw back*; and 2 Peter ii. 18, 20, 22, Heb. vi. 4-6, 1 Cor. ix. 27. Paul, converted at Damascus, feared lest, after all, he *should be a cast away*, 1 Cor. ix. 27. There

* See an excellent sermon by Harvey, of Falmouth.

is a wilful sin, after receiving the truth, for which there remaineth no more sacrifice, Heb. x. 26 ; there is a tasting of the word of God, and a falling away into incapability of renewal, vi. 4, 5, 6 ; there is a drawing back unto perdition, x. 39.

Luther was the mighty instrument in the hands of Providence for bursting the willow-bands which the harlot of Rome had bound around the minds of men. His attack on the sale of indulgences, and on the supremacy of the pope, involved an opposition to a large number of the popish errors. The doctrines of Luther are contained in the Augsburg Confession, comprising *twenty-one articles* on the religious opinions of the reformers, and *seven* more exposing the errors of the church of Rome, viz. communion in one kind, forced celibacy of the clergy, private masses, auricular confession, legendary traditions, monastic vows, and the excessive power of the church.

In regard to absolute predestination, entire depravity, and irresistible grace, the sentiments of Luther were Calvinistic : but many of the modern Lutherans have departed from these doctrines. The Augsburg Confession indeed abstains from the mention of predestination : and it is now spoken of as a consequence of foreknowledge, and not by the antecedent will of God. Luther at one time rejected the Epistle of St. James and the Apocalypse ; but they are now both received in the Lutheran church. Luther held that justification is through faith, and that good works are valuable as the effects of faith. His leading peculiarity of doctrine was consubstantiation—*verus panis et verum corpus Christi*, saying that Christ is in the bread, as fire is in the red hot iron. This, too, is in great measure abandoned or modified by the modern Lutherans. Towards the close of the seventeenth century, the Lutherans adopted the Arminian principle of toleration to all who did not disturb the peace of civil society. Though Luther published a liturgy on the model of the mass-book, every Lutheran state may have its own liturgy, only observing the essential doctrines of the Gospel. Conse-

quently they indulge in a large variety of rites,—many of them approaching to the superstitions of Rome; one of which is that of exorcising in baptism. The Lutheran church-government is carried on by consistories. They admit of no separate orders or dignities among the clergy, as enjoined by the Gospel, but allow subordination to be expedient. The consistories are civil and ecclesiastical law-courts, inspecting the characters and affairs of the clergy. In Denmark and Sweden the episcopal government remains. The articles of Smalcald, drawn up by Luther, are less harsh than the Augsburg Confession, and were attempts at a compromise with Rome. The form of concord, drawn up by six doctors, is not generally received. It was published at Torgau in 1576, being intended to separate the Lutherans from the reformed, or Calvinistic church. It condemned the low notions of the eucharist which the reformed had adopted.

124. *What constitutes a saint, and what is the distinction between saints before and saints after the Gospel-dispensation? What is the difference between the same saints whilst living amongst men, and when, after death, living in heaven?*

The literal meaning of the word *ἅγιος*, *saint*, is “separated from the earth” (α priv. and γῆ), a person lifted above this world. The thing requisite to make a saint, then, is holiness, *ἁγιασμα*; refusal of conformity to the base principles, transient vanities, and unworthy pursuits of this world, *setting the affections on things above*, devotedness to God, Col. iii. 2. As man is by nature evil, this is the work of the Holy Spirit, and called sanctification, *ἁγιοσύνη*, Phil. iii. 20. Saints under the Gospel-dispensation are those who have their conversation, their citizenship, *πολιτεῖα*, in heaven; being fellow-citizens with angels, and of the household of God, Ephes. ii. 19; and together with the angels living in love and devotion, as the whole family of heaven and earth, iii. 15. This is called the communion of saints; members in a body, of which Christ is the head, under whom each member contributes its part towards the sustenance and comfort of the other members; and *the whole body, fitly joined*

together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, maketh increase unto the edifying of itself in love, iv. 16.

Sanctification is on earth a progressive work, and the best saints are here imperfect; and this must continue till there shall be a perfecting of the saints; till *we all come unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ*, Eph. iv. 14. Then shall grace be turned into glory; the saints will be as the angels, *ισάγγελοι*, admitted to the participation of everlasting glory and happiness. Sanctification, like justification, may be averted and reversed by a sinner falling back to perdition on earth; but in heaven they go no more out, Heb. x. 39, Rev. iii. 12.

125. *Ember-weeks.*

The ember-weeks are four stated seasons for fasting: these are after the first Sunday in Lent, the feast of Pentecost, the 14th of September, and the 13th of December. In each of these weeks the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, are fasts: and in such weeks ordinations canonically take place in the church of England, when prayer is offered in the church for the candidates. The name has been conceived to be borrowed from the ashes strewed by penitents on their heads; but embers signify *hot ashes*,—a quality which has never been prescribed even by the church of Rome: and it is more probable that these weeks derive their name from “ymbren,” or “embren,” a *course* or *circuit*.—BROUGHTON'S *Dict. art. Ember*; NARES'S *Gloss.*

126. *Did any circumstances occur during our Saviour's life to prove that the Jews did not use extemporary prayers?*

When our Saviour *was praying in a certain place, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples*, Luke xi. 1. In answer to which he gave them the Lord's prayer as a model; and it is remarked by Lightfoot, that the whole of this admirable prayer, except the clause *as we forgive our debtors*, is in substance found in the nineteen prayers of the Jewish liturgy. The doxology is of uncertain authority; Bloomfield, vol. i. p. 32; Horne, *Introd.* vol. ii. p. 563. In private and secret prayer a man may pour

out his soul unto God according to the spontaneous dictates of his immediate wants; but in public prayer there must be consent in the words as well as the matter; and this our Lord knew, and allowed in saying, *When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do.* This being a transition into the plural number, from the two preceding verses, which are in the singular, and relate to private devotion, is a proof that in public the Jews used liturgies, or common forms, Matt. vi. 5, 6, 7. But Joseph Mede clearly demonstrates that the delivery of the Lord's prayer in St. Luke was given on another occasion on the Mount—the latter being an answer to a request of the disciples, *Lord, teach us to pray*, and after Christ had been praying, not preaching; the first in the second year, and the last in the third year, of our Lord's public ministry. Christ then intended it as a form of prayer, and not as a model.

127. *On an established precomposed liturgy.*

"The established church is reasonable in regard to its forms. One of those advices which deservedly gave Solomon the name of the wise man, is, *Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter any thing before God; for God is in heaven, and thou on earth; therefore let thy words be few;* and it might be added, on the same grounds, let thy words be reverentially preconsidered. When we contrast the majesty of God with our own littleness, and his purity with our guiltiness, we cannot but acknowledge that we ought to approach him with awe, and with the dread of saying any thing that may be rash, indecent, or irreverent. For this purpose a liturgy, or form of prayer, is the best calculated. Forms have the advantage over extemporaneous prayer; they are equally dictated by the Spirit, because the Spirit may influence those who compose them in their studies, as well as another in the moment of offering unpremeditated petitions. A liturgy informs us, before we repair to the house of worship, what prayers are to be offered in our name; we have a previous opportunity of studying them, and of either approving of their excellence, or (if we dislike them) of resolving to absent ourselves from the place where petitions obnoxious to us are presented. Again: while the minister is

reading, our attention is not divided—we have nothing to think of but our devotion. How differently situated is a congregation listening to an extemporaneous prayer, wherein he who is their organ and mouth may shock his fellow-worshippers, while they are lifted on the wing of adoration, by vulgar expressions, or ignorant, unlawful, trifling, uncharitable supplications; and while communing with the Almighty in their name, make them advance opinions different from those they hold, as well as prefer petitions foreign to their wishes or principles! Whatever beauty and propriety the original composers of a liturgy have given it, continue with it on all occasions. All who join in it are sure that neither incapacity, nor indolence, nor lukewarmness, nor occasional elevation or depression of spirits; neither political bias, nor malignant passions, nor want of orthodoxy, nor excess of enthusiasm in their minister, can communicate themselves to the supplications which are offered in their name and in their behalf, as may be obviously done wherever there is no form of prayer.”—GRANT'S *Sermon on the Reasonableness of the Church of England*.

“It certainly does appear to me that an established liturgy is an indispensable requisite of public worship, if the house of God is really to be a house of prayer, as we all acknowledge it ought to be. What is the principal object of our assembling together in public worship? Is it not that our supplications to the Almighty, enforced by the *concord of many hearts*, may receive that fulfilment which our Saviour has promised to his disciples, when *they shall agree as touching any thing they shall ask*? When it is asked, as it often is, why the prayers of the congregation may not be left to the discretion of the clergy as well as the sermon, the answer is, that the cases have no resemblance to each other: the sermon is the act of the minister alone—the prayers are the simultaneous act of the minister and congregation. If St. Paul speaks of *praying with the spirit*, he also speaks of *praying with the understanding*. The spirit indeed may pray, but the understanding may be unfruitful. The minister and the congregation never, in such a case, make their common supplications to the Almighty with one accord. The people are cut off from the possibility of

uniting, with a full concurrent assent of the understanding, in the extemporaneous appeal of their minister, by the limited faculties of the human soul. The operation demanded of them exceeds their abilities as men: for they have first to attend to his words; they have next to consider the sense of them; they have next to judge of their lawfulness; they have, after these things, to assent to them with the will; and they have, lastly, to offer up with their affections the petition which his words embrace. But, what is more, all these actions, each of which requires time, must be done at once, in an instant, and that every instant, or the hearers are left behind and outstripped by the volubility of their teacher. On these grounds, then, I conclude, that as far as the great object of public worship is concerned, the meeting together to address, with one consent, our common supplications to the Almighty, extemporaneous prayer involves all the objections which can be alleged against prayer in an unknown tongue."—HARNESSE'S *Sermons*, Sermon IV.; and BISSE'S *Beauty of Holiness*.

128. Omnipotence of God, and his eternal duration.

God, the Creator of all things, must have all things under his feet—the great First Cause must rule all effects. It would be a solecism to say, there is any thing beyond the power of God, since that would destroy the very nature of God. There are not two contending powers in the universe, one good, and the other independently malignant. *I form the light and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil, saith the Lord*, Isaiah xlv. 7. *The Lord hath made all things for himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil*, Prov. xvi. 4. *With God all things are possible*, Mark x. 27. *He is the holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come*, Rev. iv. 8. *Hallelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth*, Rev. xix. 6.

Again, as to his duration: his power is eternal; for he is, in all his attributes, the Alpha and Omega. *Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations*, Psalm cxlv. 13, cxlvi. 10. *Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, be honour and glory for ever and ever, Amen*, 1 Tim. i. 17.

129. *External evidence that God sent our Saviour to reveal his will to men.*

Jesus Christ is the person in whom all the *prophecies* centre, and all the types are realised: *the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy*, Rev. xix. 10; and *to him give all the prophets witness*, Acts x. 43. Again, as was foretold of him, he worked many *miracles*; nay, the very miracles specified; for his appropriation of the lesson at Nazareth (Luke iv. 18) is taken literally from Isaiah lxi. 1, as his answer to the messenger of John refers to Isaiah xxxv. 5, 6. In particular, the raising of his own body from the grave, which he had himself predicted, combined the external evidences of prophecy and miracle, John ii. 19, x. 18. If—*Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee* (Psalm ii. 7)—adopted in Acts xiii. 33, as applicable to Christ: if—*Behold, mine Elect*, &c.; *I have put my Spirit upon him*, &c.; *he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles* (Isaiah xlii. 1)—likewise adopted in Matt. xii. 18,—if both these texts be compared with the fluttering of the Spirit, and the voice of the Father, *This is my beloved Son*, which came from heaven at the transfiguration of Jesus, Matt. xvii. 5,—we can be in no doubt that God spake to mankind through him, according to the external evidence of *prophecy*. And it is certain that to the reality of his *miraculous* transfiguration, St. John, one of the three witnesses of it, alluded in the words, *And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory (the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth*, John i. 14. The other two witnesses, Peter and James, sealed their testimony to this and the other miracles of Jesus with their blood. Again, St. Paul thus opens his Epistle to the Hebrews, *God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past to the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, the heir of all things, &c.*, Heb. i. 1, 2. *That in the ages to come, he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace towards us through Jesus Christ*, Eph. ii. 7.

This is that great light which shone upon the people who sat in darkness, and who called himself the light or revelation

of the world, Isaiah ix. 2, John xii. 46, applying *prophecy* to himself (John v. 46), and mighty in deeds and words, in signs and wonders and *miracles*, Luke xxiv. 19, Acts ii. 22.

By whom, indeed, could the great invisible Spirit better make known his will, than by Him who was *the brightness of his glory, the express image of his person*? Heb. i. 3. *No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him, ἐξηγήσατο, disclosed him*, John i. 18.

130. *Benevolence of God proved by the light of nature.*

We might reason *à priori* that God is benevolent; for a being perfectly happy must be perfectly good; and a malignant being can neither be good nor happy. God, by his omnipotence, must be what he pleases; and his first pleasure must be personal happiness, which is inconsistent with the causeless misery of his creatures. Happiness is perfected by a communication of happiness; and what but benevolence, or a desire of dispensing happiness, could have induced God, a being independently happy, to call his creatures into existence? If, therefore, there are disorders in the universe, or seeming evils, it is part of this presumption *à priori*, that these contribute indirectly to happiness. If God be cruel, he must have formed intelligent creatures to fear and hate him—which cannot be supposed consistently with his desire of happiness. But the happiness of the Creator must consist in being loved, which presupposes benevolence.

Anterior to revelation, God left not himself without a witness of his benevolence to the heathens, *in that he did good, and gave them rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with joy and gladness*, Acts xiv. 17.

The benevolence of God is breathed out on the flower of the field, excelling in the glory of its beauties, drinking the dews and scenting the gale, and seeming to delight in its existence; so that a poet writes—

And 'tis my creed that ev'ry flower
Enjoys the air it breathes.

WORDSWORTH.

God clothes all animals with weapons of defence, calls them into existence when food is provided for them, adapts their organs to their modes of life, and their capacities to their enjoyments. His chief blessings, light, and air, and water, are common and universal. He gives the animals suitable instincts for self-preservation and the care of their young; and if they are short-lived and liable to evil, they enjoy the present, and are not afflicted with apprehension. But it is reserved for man to experience the chief manifestation of the Divine benevolence,—health, food, raiment, friends, connexions—the pleasantness and variety of seasons—the beauty of the earth and grandeur of the heavens—the arts and sciences of life—protecting government—liberty of conscience;—the notices of all these are the contributions of natural theology to prove the benevolence of God. If natural and moral evil be objected against the Divine benevolence, we answer—that he wisely permits these, to train his rational creatures and free agents for higher enjoyments, and to inculcate the probability of the winding up of his plan in a future state. Many of the evils of which we complain are occasioned by the abuse of our own free-will; and as to the remaining physical evils, they may all be explained on principles of optimism. They prepare us for certain death, and, on principles of natural religion, for probable immortality, being themselves one evidence of that probability. Provision is made by Divine benevolence for the mitigation of many evils,—rest for fatigue, shade from heat, medicines for disease, and sleep for pain. Many evils exalt happiness by contrast: *post nubila Phœbus*; and the rainbow is beautiful on the dark bosom of the storm. Some evils are alleviated by habit, and some by coming in succession.

131. *Baptism by laymen or females.*

There were deaconesses in the church so early as the days of the apostles; for Phœbe exercised that office to the church at Cenchrea, Rom. xvi. 1. In baptism, they undressed the female catechumens—as was becoming; and dressed them after immersion, as they had catechised them privately before baptism: but it does not appear that they administered the sacrament of baptism. A notion of the indispensableness of baptism

to salvation permitted baptism in the Romish church to be performed by laymen and midwives;* and a constitution of Archbishop Peckham allows it in cases of danger (Lyndwood, 41); as do two others of Edmond of Abingdon. Even in the beginning of the Reformation, by two rubrics of 2 and 5 of Edward the Sixth, the practice is allowed in extreme cases. It was condemned in a MS. act of convocation 1575, which was not published in the thirty-nine articles; but the ambiguity remained till the Hampton Court conference, when the bishops were ordered to explain the point. This they did in the rubric to the Book of Common Prayer, which was published the same year (1604); and enjoined, that even in private houses, when great need compels men to baptise, "the *ministers* shall dip the infant in the water, or pour water upon it;" thus positively excluding all lay baptisms, that the question of rebaptism (also discussed at Hampton Court) might be set to rest. But in the *canons* and *constitutions* of 1603, "every private man, whether minister or other," is ordered reverently to retain the *cross in baptism*, prescribed by public authority. The words "or other" seem to admit of lay-baptism; and a respect which would not nullify a sacrament, though irregularly administered, forbade rebaptisation. Yet the order for public and *private* baptism speaks only of "the priest;" and the rubric, or form, "If thou art not already baptised," &c. "I baptise thee," &c. seems intended to correct lay and *every* irregularity.

Bishop Fleetwood, who died in 1723, says that lay-baptism is not declared invalid by any rubric, office, or public act; nor hath the church ever ordered rebaptisation by a lawful minister, without determining the indispensable necessity of baptism to salvation, as the doctrine of the church of England. This prelate is persuaded that it is necessary where it can be had, and ought to be administered by a layman rather than not at all, where a lawful minister is not present. Indeed, the early church admitted baptism by laymen, although not by women. By the canon law (*Instit. Justin.* 2, 3, A.D. 529), "*Baptizandi cura ad solos sacerdotes pertinet, ejusque ministerium, nec ipsis diaconis*

* Tancred, in the 12th book of the *Jerusalem*, having slain Clorinda, baptises her in water taken in his helmet from a brook before her death.

explere permittitur, absque episcopo vel presbytero : his procul absentibus, *ultima* languoris cogat necessitas ; quo casu et laicis fidelibus atque ipsis mulieribus baptizare permittitur." Thus the canon-law allows both women and laymen to perform the ceremony in cases of extreme necessity. But the twenty-third article of our religion, compared with the nineteenth, positively excludes all lay-baptism.

This matter, which has not long ago been brought into discussion, involves three points :—

I. Whether salvation is lost by no baptism at all : to which it is replied by those who are called the high-church advocates, that the child, or person unbaptised, is left to the *uncovenanted* mercy of God.

II. Whether baptism by a dissenting minister is lay-baptism. This is maintained by the high-church party, who thus leave to the uncovenanted mercy of God the whole church of Scotland, all dissenters, and their own pious Archbishop Secker.

III. Whether, after such baptism, there ought to be rebaptism by a lawful minister ; and where there is not, whether Christian burial according to the rites of the church can be granted to a child thus irregularly baptised. Here it may be remarked, that refusal of Christian burial does not imply refusal to deposit the child in consecrated ground, but refusal of the *church-service* ; and again, that the church places in the same predicament with dissenters, children of church of England parents dying not, or irregularly baptised.*

132. *On confession of faith.*

Confession of faith ought properly to be *profession* ; but inherits its present name from the ancient church, where persons dragged before heathen magistrates, and interrogated as to their

* This question was tried in the case of the Rev. John Wight Weeks, against whose refusal to bury a dissenter, as not regularly baptised, Sir John Nicholl pronounced sentence, — Bishop Burgess and Archdeacon Daubeney, both in masterly pamphlets, strongly vituperating the decision. The cause was to have been carried by appeal to the Court of Delegates ; but in the meantime Mr. Weeks died ; and the point which he had been set forth amiably to try has ever since remained in its state, under Sir J. Nicholl's decision.

faith, *confessed* that they were Christians ; knowing that instant death was the consequence, and could be avoided only by an expedient lie, which they disdained. Such persons were called *confessors*. According to St. Cyprian, he who voluntarily presented himself to torture was called, not *confessor*, but *professor* ; as he who, through faint-heartedness, shunned the trial, and became a voluntary exile to avoid it, was termed *ex terris*.

Probably it was in immediate, though not exclusive prospect, of the trials and sufferings of the early Christians, and in a knowledge that their blood would be the seed of the church, that our Lord delivered the promise and the threat contained in Matt. x. 32 and Luke xii. 8, 9, *Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God : but he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God*. The Jews had agreed, that if any man did confess that Jesus is Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue ; and there were timid, worldly-minded disciples, who came to Jesus by night, like Nicodemus ; or who, like Joseph of Arimathea, were disciples secretly, for fear of the Jews ; or who, like Demas, in seasons of danger deserted their more determined brethren, having loved the present world.

Widely different was the example of our Lord, *who before Pilate witnessed a good confession*, 1 Tim. vi. 13. Different the examples of Stephen, and Paul, and Peter, and the noble army of martyrs. By the contagion of their deaths, the disciples were made courageous ; and afterwards, when copies of the Scriptures were multiplied, a man who, to shun persecution, delivered up his Bible, was designated by the contemptuous phrase, *traditor*, whence comes our word, "traitor." But in the present times it is not sufficient to *confess* the faith only, when interrogated, or threatened with inconvenience or persecution ; and though the name may be retained, the duty ought to be bold and open *profession*. In an age of indifference, formality, and unbelief, men must not smuggle their belief, either through fear of ridicule, or desire of keeping well with the world ; but come forth under the banners of their Master, and rank with those who are on the Lord's side, *going to him without the camp, bearing his reproach*, Heb. xiii. 13.

By regular attendance in the house of God, and not shrinking from the altar, let them prove that, while *with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, with the mouth confession is made unto salvation*, Rom. x. 10. As Daniel then publicly professed his faith, by worshipping at his opened windows, looking towards Jerusalem under the woe of captivity and reproach of the captors, so *let every knee bow at the name of Jesus, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*, Philip. ii. 10, 11; for, *If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved*, Rom. x. 9. The word *martyr*, "witness," has long been applied to the heroic spirits who suffer *death* for the truth; *confessor* is now the appellation of those who endure persecution or pain for the same cause, though not with the loss of life. When ideas attached to words vary, the words should be changed. It was pedantry in Bishop Watson to style his answer to Paine, *An APOLOGY for the Bible*. Let confession be *profession*, and apologies *vindications*.

133. Quote a passage from a profane author establishing the authenticity of the Pentateuch.

The authenticity of the Pentateuch is established by various profane authors, cited by Grotius, Bryant, Bishop Newton, and others. These admit Moses to have been the leader of the Jews and founder of their laws; and some of them ascribe to him divine inspiration. The apostate Julian and the impostor Mahomet allow Moses to have been instructed from above: and many authors mention the different facts which he records;—the creation, the deluge, Babel, the Exodus, the Sabbath, circumcision, &c. &c. Almost all mythologies are obscurer traditional confirmations of these subjects. We shall select as authors, Juvenal, Longinus, Porphyry, and Sir William Jones.

JUVENAL.

Judaicum ediscunt, et servant, et metuunt jus,
Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses.

LONGINUS.

Ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης εἶπον, ὁ Θεὸς φασὶ τι, γενέσθω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο. Longinus is here speaking of sublimity in writing, and, it is true, does not ascribe inspiration to Moses; but the question relates to the authenticity of the Pentateuch, and Longinus (A.D. 273) calls Moses οὐχ ὁ τυχῶν ἀνὴρ, *not an ordinary man*. But other heathen writers might be cited who attribute Divine teaching to Moses; *e.g.* Diodorus Siculus and Strabo. Julian, as great an enemy to the Jews as to the Christians, allows their lawgiver the power of working miracles.

PORPHYRY,

A learned enemy of Christianity, born A.D. 223, and a disciple of Longinus, acknowledged that Moses was prior to the Phœnician historian Sanchoniathon; and contended for the truth of Sanchoniathon's account of the Jews, from its coincidence with the Mosaic history. — HORNE'S *Introduction*, vol. i. p. 65.

SIR WILLIAM JONES,

After shewing that throughout Asia the memory of a deluge, and the early dispersion of men in three divisions, one of them under Japhet, is preserved (*audax Iapeti genus*, HOR.), adds:—"Thus the first eleven chapters of Genesis are a preface to the oldest civil history now extant. We see the truth of them confirmed by antecedent reasoning, and by evidence, in part highly probable, and in part certain; but the connexion of the Mosaic history with that of the Gospel, by a chain of sublime predictions, unquestionably ancient, and apparently fulfilled, must induce us to think the Hebrew narrative more than human in its origin, and consequently true in every substantial part of it."—*Discourse IX.*

The first four books of Josephus contain a history, tallying with the narrative of the Pentateuch, down to the death of Moses. The same writer, pursuing the sacred history, mentions the laying up of the law in the temple, in the reign of Josiah.

Josephus further writes (*contra Apion*, book i. § 8), "For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, dis-

agreeing from and contradicting one another (as the Greeks have), but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past time, which are justly believed to be divine: and of them, five belong to Moses, which contain his laws, and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death." *

Infidelity has made its last rally with a corps of geological sappers and miners; but they have fought pretendedly under the sanction of men of eminence, who have tried to establish a creation of high antiquity; which they reconcile, in their own way, to the account of the Pentateuch,—for they are still believers in revelation, and, we doubt not, sincere. In a science so new, however, and so changeable as to its hypotheses, their dogmas are by no means certain, and cannot overturn the preface to the sacred volume, *IN THE BEGINNING God created the heavens and the earth*. Now, in the first three chapters of Genesis, two most important doctrines are embodied in the history, viz. the institution of the Sabbath, and the introduction of death by sin; and unless men become open infidels, and reject revelation entirely, their geology must adapt itself to these two doctrines.

The surface of the earth, so far as it has been penetrated, discovers a primary stratum of granite, &c., in which no fossil remains are ever found; above this are what are called the transition-rocks, and over these the secondary depositions, both containing remains of shells, plants, and quadrupeds, increasing in number and diversity as the strata rise towards the surface. Many of these animals belong to races now extinct, though blended with others yet remaining: but we discover no trace of human fossils. Nearest to the surface are the tertiary formations, some of which entomb human remains. Now, among the theories explaining these phenomena, the first is, that the inferior strata were the wrecks (*débris*) of a former world, or system, or

* The Rev. Stanley Faber exhibits the external testimonies of the truth of the Mosaic history in his *Horæ Mosaicæ*; Josephus quotes Manetho and Berosus; and Eusebius, in his *Præparatio Evangelica*, shews more fully the accordance of profane history with the sacred records; Grotius and his annotator Clark, Stillingfleet in his *Origines Sacræ*, Gale in his *Court of the Gentiles*, Bochart in *Phaleg*, Bryant in his *Ancient Mythology*, Maurice in his *Indian Antiquities*, and Dean Graves in his great work on the Pentateuch,—follow the same track; Harmer and Burder shew the agreement of Eastern manners and customs with the descriptions of Moses; and Leslie, in his *Method with the Deists*, reasons upon the origin of the rites and festivals.

state of things, destroyed before the hexameron began, for some cause, of which we are ignorant. This gets rid of the difficulty arising from death as the result of sin, *so far as our present world is concerned*. It may be admitted without injury to revelation; but there is no authority for it in Scripture. The second theory converts the hexameron from six days to six long and indefinite periods of time, during which, many revolutions, and superpositions of stratum upon stratum, each containing various animals, took place. This is the fashionable doctrine at present; but it manifestly overthrows the reason for observing the Sabbath,—(since a DAY must have the same meaning in both clauses of the fourth commandment, Exod. xx. 11); and likewise the principle of sin as the origin of death. It has been said, indeed, that the three first days may have been unlimited portions of duration, as they could not have been literal days before the sun was created. Yet even this will not do; for there were no animals created until *after* the *fourth* day, and the question relates to the animal remains deeply imbedded in fossil strata, none of which could die before the *sin of man*. The third hypothesis (that of Fairholme) professes to adapt itself strictly to the Mosaic narrative. The sun is said to have been created from the beginning, but not to have struggled out from the enveloping mist until the fourth day of the creation (see also Penn); and all the phenomena of geology are reconciled to present appearances,—

1st, by the change of land into sea, and sea into land; 2dly, by the force of currents propelling the tropical animals northward; and, 3dly, by the subsidence of the different strata enclosing their several animals during the sediment after the deluge. This latter theory, however, fails in the account of the rivers in Paradise, and in other striking particulars.

Amidst so many hypotheses, no one exactly satisfactory, is there no secure rock, no point on which we can fall back? Yes, there is; the Primary Cause—the Fiat of *Him who doeth whatsoever he pleaseth in heaven and in earth, in seas and deep places*, Ps. cxxxv. 6. (See *Preface*.)

Dr. Graves thus chalks out his masterly work:—"The proof of the history of these books may be deduced, either from the external testimony by which their truth and genuineness is supported, or from the internal structure of the works them-

selves. The former topic I have already noticed, and endeavoured to shew that these books have been received by the Jews from the very first settlement of their nation, as containing an authentic and faithful account of their lawgiver and his institutions. I now proceed to confirm the conclusion thus derived from the testimony of the Jewish nation, still further, by considering the internal structure of the history itself."

The account given of the creation has never been successfully contradicted by infidelity; nay, it tallies wonderfully with modern discoveries. All mankind are clearly derived from one stock; and their difference in colour, &c. may be ascribed to CLIMATE, government, civilisation; while their universal agreement in a corrupt nature (not remarked in the instincts of the lower animals) is a still stronger mark of common descent. See Smith of Philadelphia's *Answer to Lord Kaimes*; Wiseman's *Lectures*; and Pritchard's *Physical History of Man*. Geology has ascertained that there is no trace of MAN having existed before the time assigned by Moses. This is allowed and maintained even by the advocates of a former world, and infidelity itself has never denied it. Yet geologists will have an earth peopled by saurians, contradicting the moral attributes of God: they will have almost an eternity of matter;—but in six days God made heaven and earth; and by faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, Heb. xi. 3. The manners of the patriarchs are precisely what philosophers have described in their speculations into the state of man in an early condition of society: Harmer; Burder; Millar on *Ranks*; *Fragments*, &c. to Calmet; *Pictorial Bible*; Kaimes's *Sketches*; Ferguson on *Civil Society*; Grant's *Essays on the Origin of Society*. Of a deluge there are indisputable marks; and though languages differ, they yet have some groundwork of a common structure; Pritchard on *Origin of Languages from the East*; Sir W. Jones, &c. Wiseman's first and second lectures are a learned exposition of ethnographical science, and vindication of the unity of languages, as the remains of Babel. The names of the nations of antiquity are evidently derived from the early patriarchs of the three families, as described by Moses; Wells' *Geography*: and heathen mythology has been traced to the

same source; Gale's *Court of the Gentiles*; and an announced work by Cole, *Ancient Mythology illustrating Scripture*. The ceremonial laws were a wise introduction to the Christian system, when it should be brought forward in the fulness of time; Shuttleworth's *Connexion*; Grant's *Shadows and Substance*; *Oxford Manual of Divinity*. Men in early ages transmit records in monuments, and converse by symbols, such as Moses describes; see *Proofs of Christianity from Monuments*; and Taylor's *Illustrations of Calmet*. Prophecy and type speak plainly as to the coming of the Messiah; and the moral laws of the Jews have been the grand foundation of all codes of jurisprudence.

Dr. Graves has shewn that the civil institutions of Moses are just and merciful, bespeaking a wisdom more than human; while the wisest legislators have every where caught their spirit, bowing to the oracle of Sinai, and drinking at the rock of Horeb. The artless simplicity of Moses is a proof of early truth; the genealogies, and the geographical statements of the Pentateuch, are all correct. The doctrine of the unity and invisibility of the Godhead is a proof, amidst surrounding idolatry, that the Pentateuch came from heaven; and there is an admirable philosophy in all the civil and religious enactments of Moses. There are even vestiges and traditions of his miracles: Dr. Adam Clarke wore at his neck a silver chain with a piece of the rock of Horeb—the only existing original type of Christ; a rock which distinctly bears the marks of the channel where the waters flowed.

Some writers have maintained that Moses borrowed the materials of his history from traditions of the patriarchs, and yet admit a superintending care of God. This argument savours of rationalism, and comes from Germany; and in vain does Bishop Gleig (half a rationalist), in his edition of Stackhouse, vol. i. p. 24, attempt to smoothe down its dangerous consequences by saying, "It is of no consequence whether Moses compiled the book of Genesis from annals preserved in the family of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or wrote the whole of it by immediate inspiration; for on either supposition it is a narrative of Divine authority, and contains an authentic account of facts which

constitute the foundation of the Jewish and Christian religions ; or, to use more accurate language, the one great but progressive scheme of revealed religion." We have an argument little short of mathematical demonstration, that the *substance* of the Pentateuch proceeded from Moses ; and that the very *words* were written by him (under the dictation or superintendence of God), though not so mathematically demonstrable as the former, is at least a moral certainty. The Jews, whose evidence alone can decide in the present instance, have believed this from the earliest to the present age. No other person ever aspired to be thought the author ; and we may venture to affirm, that no other could have been the author. " For it is wholly incredible that the Jews, though weak and superstitious, would have received in a later age a set of writings as the genuine work of Moses, if no history and no tradition had preserved the remembrance of his having been the author."—BISHOP MARSH'S *Authenticity of the Pentateuch*, pp. 7 and 8.

134. *Natural and moral attributes of God.*

The *natural* attributes of God are — unity, eternity, omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, happiness : the *moral* attributes of God are — holiness, wisdom, justice, veracity, benevolence, mercy. These attributes are inseparably connected, and cannot be exerted in contradiction to each other ; for wherever God's unity, omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence, are traced, they can do nothing contrary to his holiness, justice, benevolence, and mercy ; nor could his moral attributes do any thing destructive to his eternal and perfect happiness. In the evils of life, then, we may be assured that there is some benevolent intention—some intention to spare the veracity and justice of God from entering into painful league with his omniscience and power, of which his sinful creatures might be the victims. These evils are illustrations of that goodness of God which leadeth to repentance ; for as God's happiness would be affected by the permitted sufferings of his creatures, and his attributes called in question, if these sufferings were arbitrary, we must admit them to be only correctives. God is love, and must always lean to the side of benevolence ; yet as he cannot

part with his holiness, veracity, or justice, we must believe, that if his *wisdom* form a plan for the reconciliation of his mercy with these qualities, his power can execute that plan; so that, as he is himself perfectly happy, the greatest possible portion of happiness will in the end result to his creatures.

135. *Fallacy of the Mohammedan doctrine.*

The Messiah, by the word of prophecy, was to come from *Isaac*, and not from Ishmael — which is fatal to the claims of Mahomet. *In Isaac shall thy seed be called*, Gen. xxi. 12, Rom. ix. 7, Heb. xi. 18.

Mahomet, an artful impostor, stole from Judaism the doctrine of the unity of God, and acknowledged the leading facts and miracles both of the Old and New Testaments, describing Christ as the chief of prophets, the *Logos*, or Word of God, and consigning to eternal punishment all who do not believe in Jesus, the son of *Mary*. But on these acknowledgments he builds his own falsehoods. He denies Christ to be the Son of God, equal with the Father, though Christ gave himself that name, and God sanctioned his pretensions at his baptism and transfiguration. Mahomet here is a Socinian. In granting the truth of Scripture, he grants too much; and no one can be a consistent Mohammedan on his principles. His indulgence of sensuality, and promise of a sensual paradise, are in open contradiction to the Gospel, which condemns the adultery even of the thoughts and eye; and declares, *Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God*;—adding, that a man must be the husband of *one* wife, with whom the union is in life inseparable. The Gospel forbids fornication; while the Koran allows four wives, and an unlimited number of concubines.

The Scripture saith in the Apocalypse, *If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book*, Rev. xxii. 18. Yet Mahomet adds himself as a prophet superior to Christ, the Alpha and Omega; and his doctrine is well described by Gibbon as composed of an eternal truth and a daring falsehood, viz. that there is one God, and that Mahomet is his prophet.

Mahomet declares (*Koran*, ch. lxi. p. 431, SALE, vol. ii.) that

he was the *Paraclete*, or comforter promised in the Gospel, and sent down ten days after the ascension: and this may well be called the sin against the Holy Ghost, which the Scripture hath declared shall not be forgiven, Matt. xii. 32. The fallacy, then, is forgetfulness, or denial that the same Scriptures which he allows, say, ὁ παράκλητος τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, John xiv. 26.

The whole tenour of the Gospel breathes peace, private and public; *on earth peace*, was its introduction; the kingdom of God is joy and *peace*; the fruit of the Spirit is joy, love, and *peace*; and the inculcation of the apostles, *follow peace with all men*. Mahomet was a man whose whole life was spent in war, and in disturbing the peace of unoffending nations; but he promised remission of sins to all who should die in battle. This, with his doctrine of predestination, answered his purposes of leading on aggression and promoting courage; but the fallacy of the principles is refuted by reason and feeling, apart from Scripture, which condemns all but defensive war, and opposes fatalism, every where addressing men as commanded and enabled to use all feasible means for attaining good and eschewing evil.

Even in the Old Testament, David was prohibited from building the Temple, because he was a man of blood. Mahomet calls the *sword* the gate of heaven and hell. Mahomet wrought no miracle to confirm his pretensions: Christ was a man approved by miracles, and these were miracles of mercy and beneficence; and they are sealed by the blood of martyrs. Mahomet's religion is sensual: Christ's is wholly spiritual, requiring purity of thought and self-denial. "Go," says Bishop Sherlock, "go to your natural religion: lay before her Mahomet and his disciples, arrayed in armour and in blood, riding in triumph over the spoils of thousands, who fell by his victorious sword: shew her the cities which he set in flames, the countries which he ravaged and destroyed, and the miserable distress of all the inhabitants of the earth. When she has viewed him in this scene, carry her into his retirements: shew her the prophet's chamber, his concubines and wives. Let her see his adultery; and hear him allege revelation and a divine commission to justify his lust and his oppression. When she is tired

with this prophet, then shew her the blessed Jesus, humble and meek, doing good to all the sons of men, patiently instructing both the ignorant and perverse; let her see him in his most retired privacies; let her follow him to the mount; and hear his devotions and supplications to God. Carry her to his table, to view his homely fare, and hear his heavenly discourses; let her see him injured, but not provoked; let her attend him to the tribunal, and consider the patience with which he endured the scoffs and reproaches of his enemies. Lead her to his cross, and let her view him in the agony of death; and hear his last prayer for his persecutors, *Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.*

“When natural religion has viewed both, ask, Which is the prophet of God? But her answer we have already told. When she saw part of this scene through the eyes of the centurion who attended at the cross, by him she spoke, and said, *Truly this man was the Son of God.*”

136. *Silence of great and learned heathens concerning Christianity.*

Before Christ appeared, the purely classical age, both of Greece and Rome, had passed away. It is true that the prophecies had announced a mighty Ruler from the East, who should govern the world, and that Daniel had fixed the time of his appearing. It is likewise true that the Septuagint had conveyed these predictions into most civilised countries; and that Moses had in every nation those who read him on their Sabbath. But heathen writers numbered these sayings with obscure oracles (probably kept in remembrance by the turbulent Jews, as a pretence for any occasional rebellion, which proper watchfulness might suppress); and hence we can see why Tacitus mentions the rumour of the prophecy as a *mere coincidence* with the Jewish insurrection. The heathen ignorance of the Jewish law—the insignificant part which Palestine (a small territory 150 miles in length, and about half in breadth) sustained in the affairs of the world—the contempt in which the Jews were held, chiefly on account of their stupidity and credulity—the *credat Judeus Apella, non ego* (HOR. Sat. i. 5. 100, 1),—may account for the

slight notice of the Jewish affairs before and about the coming of Christ. Contempt made heathen writers wholly ignorant of the law and prophets. The distinguishing features of the Jewish religion—the unity and invisibility of God—which might have been a lesson to idolators, were converted into a charge of atheism; and because Pompey and Crassus had found no idol in the holy of holies, this charge gained ground. Tacitus, like modern rationalists, distorts the whole story of the Exodus, saying, that when the Israelites wanted water, Moses followed some asses pasturing in a green spot of the wilderness, till they led him to a spring; and that this happened after a thirst of seven days,—whence the Sabbath was instituted, and an ass's head worshipped in Jerusalem.

Even down to the end of the first century, Christianity was regarded as a sect of the rebellious Jews, and “a pernicious superstition, originating in the East, and breaking out in Rome, the centre to which all things atrocious and infamous flow in” (Tacitus): and it was not till the date of the famous letter of Pliny to Trajan, A.D. 103, that it was publicly known that the Christians sang a hymn in honour of one Jesus, who was dead, but was by them said to be alive and a God. Even this was still an imperfect knowledge. The persecutions previous to that time were set on foot on the charge of sedition; *These that have turned the world upside down have come hither also*, Acts xvii. 6: and Gallio's judgment was in strict conformity with his character as a heathen magistrate, whose tribunal took no cognisance of questions about words and names and the Jewish law, Acts xviii. 15.

All the classical writers after the birth of Christ were Romans, long under the patronage, and power, and awe of heathen emperors; and it is not from such authors that we should expect a vindication of Christianity: but even their silence was a proof that they could say nothing against it. With respect to Josephus, he too was a person in the Roman camp, writing under the frown of the Roman emperor, and not likely to make honourable mention of a rival to that despot's ambitious views of fulfilling the prophecies of Isaiah and Daniel. Yet even he ventures to mention Christ as “a wise man (*if it be lawful to call him a man*) and a doer of wonderful works, who appeared

to his friends the third day after his crucifixion." Nero knew nothing of the Christians but as a sect of the Jews; and after him, it is remarkable that the subsequent persecutions arose among (comparatively) the good emperors—Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, Decius, Valerianus, Aurelian, and Diocletian; because power suspects secret assemblies, and dreads liberty of conscience in religion, as leading to turbulence in civil government: while Commodus, Caracalla, and Gallienus, stopped the persecutions which their fathers had instituted—perhaps through desire to gain popularity on their accession by a change of measures; or perhaps, in their indolence, intrusting their government to favourites, who saw that the new faith grew and flourished under persecution, and, like the chamomile plant, sprang the more rankly from being trodden. Even Pliny had found (A.D. 103), that the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church.

137. *Giving a name at baptism: similar custom of heathen nations.*

In Athens, fathers were obliged to enroll their sons in the register of their particular *φωρπία*, or *ward*, which was called *κοινὸν γραμματεῖον*, when they swore that the child was lawfully born or lawfully adopted.—*Isæus de Apollad.*

Some affirm, that at every return of the Apaturia, it was customary to register all the children who had been born that year (*Etymol. auct.* in voc. ἀπαύρια); whilst others say, that they were commonly registered at three or four years of age (*Procl. in Plat. Tim.*, *Heliod. lib. i.*, *Aristoph. Ran. act i. sc. 7*). Young persons, when they arrived at the age of eighteen years, were enrolled a *second time* in a public register, and admitted into the number of the ἐφηβοί, *Poll. lib. viii. cap. 9*. At the same time their hair was shaved and consecrated to some of the gods, *ROBINSON'S Archæologia*, p. 18. The Romans had a *præpomen*, *nomen*, *cognomen*, and sometimes an *agnomen*, to mark the individual, the clan, the family; and the remarkable distinction, the *prænomen*, answering to our Christian name, used to be given to boys on the *ninth day*, which was called *dies lustricus*, or the day of purification, when certain religious ceremonies were performed; *Macrobian Sat. i. 16*; *Suet. Ner. 6*.

138. *Eternity an attribute of the Trinity.*

"Eternity is duration without beginning or end;" *Johnson*. "The life-time of God;" *Paschal*—(given as an original definition by the *sourds et muets* of Sicard in Paris. Some of these definitions are ingenious, but smell of the lamp, and are probably plagiarisms: *e.g.* what is gratitude? the memory of the heart.) "A line without either extremity;" *Orton*. "By repeating the idea of any length of duration which we have in our minds, with all the endless addition of numbers, we come by the idea of eternity;" *Locke*.

The *eternity of God* is proved by his necessary self-existence. *I am that I am*, Exod. iii. 14. "The uncaused cause of all effects." *Now unto the King ETERNAL, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be glory*, 1 Tim. i. 17. *The Lord is King for ever and ever*, Psalm x. 16, cxlv. 13, Dan. iv. 3, Exod. xv. 18, Deut. xxxii. 40, xxxiii. 27.

The *Son is everlasting—the first and the last*. *I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore*, Rev. i. 17, 18. *Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and besides me there is no God*, Isa. lxiv. 6. In Dan. vii. 13 the Son of Man is brought to the *Ancient of days*; and his dominion is an *everlasting dominion*, Micah iv. 7.

Unto the Son the Father saith, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, Ps. xlv. 6, 7, Heb. i. 8. *Christ is a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedech, who was without beginning of days or end of life; but was made like unto the Son of God, and like him abideth a priest continually*, Psalm cx. 4, Heb. vii. 1, 3.

The Holy Ghost is eternal. *Christ, through the ETERNAL SPIRIT, offered himself*, Heb. ix. 14. This is the Spirit of God, which in the beginning moved over the face of the waters. Scripture makes no distinction between God and the *Spirit*, except that of being distinct Persons. *The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us*, Rom. viii. 26. *Christ ever liveth to make intercession for us*. Now Christ is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet there is but one God. Here are two interceding

parties *with* God the Father, having a mysterious intercommunion of offices and operation. But as *Christ* ever liveth as an Intercessor, so likewise the other *Intercessor* EVER liveth.

139. *Herod was troubled*, Matt. ii. 3.

Herod was *troubled* at the arrival of the wise men to worship the infant King of the Jews, because he dreaded a rival, and knew himself to be hated by the Jews. Herod was not a Jew, but an Idumæan; he cared little for the Mosaic laws, which his manners frequently outraged: and these reasons, with his many cruelties, he feared and knew would prepare the people to take part with any competitor—especially one ushered in by so grand a display of their prophecies, and so likely to gratify their ambition. Tacitus says: “Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret oriens, profectique Judeâ rerum potirentur;” *Hist.* lib. v. p. 621. So also Suetonius: “Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judeâ profecti, rerum potirentur,” *Vespas.* p. 231, ed. Lugd. 1576. Herod must not only have known this report—this *vetus et constans opinio*, but its origin as to time in the prophecies of Daniel (chap. ix.). He must have known that the learned Jews had attached it to other prophecies; to that of Zechariah ix. 9, *Behold, your KING cometh*; to that of Micah v. 2, *Thou Bethlehem Ephrata, &c.*—whence his anxious question to the Sanhedrim, *where* Christ should be born? His reason for the question—that *he*, too, might go to worship him—was a mere fetch, as appeared by his immediately ordering the massacre of the innocents. It is probable that this *trouble* and excitement sharpened his complaints; for, in a very little while, having put to death his own son, he died five days after that climax of his crimes, in his seventieth year.

140. *Various Sabbaths of the Jews.*

The word *Sabbath*, in Hebrew שַׁבָּת, signifies *rest*, and originally signified the day on which God rested after his six days' work of creation, and, contemplating the whole, found it to be very good. This day he blessed and sanctified, because he then rested for contemplation on his labours. From that time for-

ward it was set apart for his worship, and the injunction renewed by Moses in the word *remember*. At the Exodus a fresh reason for this observance was given (Deut. v. 15), in the repose of the Israelites after their Egyptian bondage, when it was probable they were, in great measure, prevented from resting on their Sabbath; but every seventh day was still required; and the original reason—the Sabbath after the creation—was alone assigned in the fourth commandment. Professor Lee has maintained (though it is not new with him,—see Jennings, *Jewish Antiq.*) that the day was at that time changed, by being brought back to the sixth day; and that the advancement to the Lord's day, or first of the week, in the Gospel, was only a return to the primitive Sabbath. Some think the Sabbath to be only a Levitical ordinance; but as it is a type of the heavenly rest, or the *Sabbatism which remaineth*, the type is not obsolete till the substance be attained. Besides, the double portion of manna fell on the sixth day, before the giving of the Levitical law.

The Jews had, secondly, a *Sabbatical year*, when the land was appointed to rest without culture, with a promise of preternatural provision from God; as an exercise for faith, and a foretaste of the heavenly rest, when the righteous should be freed from all worldly labours and troubles, Levit. xxv. 18, &c. The Sabbatical year was called *the Sabbath of the land*, שַׁבַּת הָאֲדָמָה, Levit. xxv. 6; and the use of it is pointed out in Exodus xxiii. 11 and Levit. xxv. 1-8. It seems to have been neglected during a large portion of the time between the entrance into Canaan and the taking of Jerusalem; for in the prophecy of the captivity delivered by Moses (Levit. xxvi. 33-35), confirmed by that of Jeremiah (chap. xxv. 11, xxvi. 6, 7, xxix. 10), and that of Daniel (ix. 2), who predicted the duration of the captivity to be seventy years, —prophecies illustrated in the description of the return from Babylon (2 Chron. xxxvi. 21),—we find that the land of Judea was desolate, and rested, or kept Sabbath, seventy years; *because it did not rest on your Sabbaths when ye dwelt upon it*. Besides the permitting of the spontaneous fruits of the Sabbatical year to be common to the poor and the cattle (Exod. xxiii. 10, 11, Levit. xxv. 6, 7), debts were to be released (Deut. xv. 1, 2), hired servants to be manumitted (Exod. xxi. 2, Deut. xv. 12,

Jer. xxxiv. 15), and the law to be read at the close of the feast of tabernacles, Deut. xxxi. 10, 11.

It is thought, that in the instruction to pray that the flight may not be on the Sabbath-day (Matt. xxiv. 20), *ἐν σαββάτῳ* means the Sabbatical year, when provisions would be scarce. The Millennarians hold the Sabbatical year to be typical of their millennium—the reign of the saints for 1000 years, after the 6000 years (a day for a year) shall have been completed. This is one of their fancies. The 6000 years *are* completed; and 1000 years is only the apocalyptic or figurative number, *certus pro incerto*, for a long reign of peace in the church; as Thebes was called *ἐκατόμυλος*; or as a man says he has a *thousand* reasons for a particular course—meaning “many.”

Thirdly, the Jews had, besides the Sabbath of years, a *Sabbath of Sabbaths*, i. e., according to the Hebrew idiom, the chief Sabbath, or year of jubilee, held after every seven septenaries of years—i. e. after every forty-ninth or on every fiftieth year. It began, like the Sabbatical year, at the feast of tabernacles, or on the day of atonement, which happened but five days before it, viz. on the 10th of Tisri, Levit. xxv. 8-17. It resembled the Sabbatical year in many points; but it was a year of liberty to slaves—even to those who had had their ears bored, as voluntarily remaining after the Sabbatical year; a year of the restoration of all lands to their tribe; a year of the return of all men to their respective families; and a year of the ratification of the genealogies, Num. xxxvi. 4.

As the jubilee was a joyous occasion, some derive the name יִיבֵל* from Jubal, יִיבֵל, music being the voice of mirth, and this they say is the etymology of our word *joyal*. Parkhurst takes it from יָבַל, *jabal*, to restore, which is a sufficient etymology, sanctioned by the Septuagint ἀφῆσις, *dismissal*. This will yet apply it to another meaning—the blast of a horn, because it was announced by trumpets of rams’ horns. It was a type of the Gospel, and is plainly the basis of the metaphorical prophecy of

* It is strange that Parkhurst should say the word never signifies a *ram*; as Josh. vi. 5, “make a long blast on the *ram’s* horn,” יִיבֵל יִיבֵל יִיבֵל, is in the Septuagint σαλπίζετε σάλπιγγι τοῦ ἱερέως.

Isaiah, chap. lxi. 1, 2. Popery gives a plenary indulgence to all sinners coming to St. Peter's every fiftieth year, who can pay handsomely for the same. Parkhurst thinks the jubilee a type of the times of restitution and the eternal inheritance, to be ushered in with the sound of the trump, 1 Cor. xv. 52, 1 Thess. iv. 16. *The year of my redeemed is come*, Isa. lxiii. 4. The jubilee-year is mentioned as a Sabbath, Levit. xxv. 8-10.

Fourthly, the *high festivals* among the Jews were called Sabbaths (Levit. xix. 30), and chiefly the passover, pentecost, and feast of tabernacles. At the latter we find two Sabbaths commanded: the first day shall be a Sabbath, and the eighth day shall be a Sabbath, Levit. xxiii. 39. But the seventh day would be an ordinary Sabbath. That the Jews kept the seventh and eighth days as Sabbaths on that occasion, we learn from Plutarch, who calls them two feasts to Bacchus; and Maimonides states that the Sabbath of the eighth day was an entertainment in their own homes. This was the vintage-home, the feast of in-gathering, at the end of the civil year, Deut. xvi. 13, 14, Nehem. viii. 9, Exod. xxiii. 16, Num. xxix. 12.

Whenever a *holy convocation* is mentioned, it was kept as a Sabbath.

141. *Heresy—two senses.*

The word *heresy*, αἵρεσις, from αἰρέω, *to choose or take hold on*, was not, in its earliest acceptation, conceived to convey a reproach; being indifferently used, whether the writer or speaker approved or disapproved of the opinions mentioned. It signified the particular set of opinions, either in *philosophy* or *religion*, which a man might choose to adopt, where all were only contending schools, with equal pretensions to truth; and a Pilate might ask sensibly, "What is truth? you are all pretending to it; but who shall be the umpire?" Thus Lucian writes: εἰ δέκα μόνας θεῖμεν τὰς αἵρέσεις ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ, tom. i. p. 580; and according to Plutarch *De Plac. Philos.* lib. i. cap. 3, from Thales ἡ Ἴωνική αἵρεσις προσαγορεύθη, i. e. the Ionic sect or body was denominated. In the same manner, without blame or preference, St. Luke speaks in the Acts (v. 17) of the high-priest's attendants as of the αἵρεσις of the Sadducees; and, Acts xv. 5, of the

heresy of the Pharisees, and chap. xxviii. 22; just as these sects or choosers of opinions are mentioned by Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. xiii. cap. v. sec. 9.

But the word soon came to denote a fundamental error obstinately adhered to—of which examples appear in Acts xxiv. 24, where the charge of heresy is brought by Tertullus against Paul, and by him repelled as an affront. In 2 Peter ii. 1 we read of αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας, *heresies of destruction*, translated *damnable heresies*: and in Galatians v. 20, heresies are classed with idolatry and murder, as the works of the flesh.

Heresy in England is the denial of any essential doctrine of the catholic faith; and differs from schism, as it may exist within the bosom of the church, whereas schism always expresses separation. Schism may exist without heresy; as in the milder and more moderate Methodists. In Spain, heretics against the catholic church—that is, Protestants—are persecuted by the Inquisition; and this by virtue of an *auto da fe*, or *act of faith*—a mock trial. In this country, in the reign of Mary, the same tragedy was rehearsed by an act—*de hæretico comburendo*. One of the oaths taken by Catholic sovereigns is in these terms: “Hæreticos et schismaticos persequar et expugnabo.”

142. *Publicans were among the Jews disreputable.*

As already shewn, the Jews hated the publicans, or Roman tax-gatherers, as a badge of their subjection to imperial Rome; while, though they sometimes found it convenient to say, We have no king but Cæsar, they doubted the propriety of giving tribute to him, and had a principle of pride that they had no king but God. Avarice, as well as pride, is a motive to hatred; for who has any favour for *collectors* coming to take his money—particularly if not a lawful tax, but a tribute imposed by a power he disowns? Hence they always linked publicans and sinners—a rhetorical way of giving any body a bad name; just as the Puritan historians link Arminianism and Popery. Yet the inferior τελῶναι were of the lower order of Jews,—custom-house officers, tide-waiters, stationed in a hut, for the purpose of collecting taxes. This is called the *receipt of custom* (Matt. ix. 9), τελῶνιον: in the case of Matthew, the receipt of port-dues on

the Sea of Galilee. Some publicans came to our Lord to be baptised, and were anxious to know what they should do in proof of their sincerity in conversion; and he hints at their besetting sin of extortion in saying, *Exact no more than that which is appointed to you* (Luke iii. 13)—a sin which must have increased their ill-favour among their countrymen. Our Lord, however, in saying, *If an offender will not hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican* (Matt. xviii. 17), neither allowed the charge of extortion to be universal, nor the illiberal and indiscriminate dislike of heathens and publicans to be just; but only availed himself of that feeling of aversion as an example of the disposition of avoidance with which his disciples should hold an excommunicated person during his impenitence and obstinacy. That even the chief publicans, who were of a higher order, were not exempt from this offence of exaction (however they might repent of it), we may infer from the confession of Zaccheus—*If I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold.*

These ἀρχιτελώναι, or *collectors-general*, were often, in countries conquered by the Romans, of the equestrian order, and in Judea Jewish in descent, but noble in dignity; ἄνδρας ἱππικοῦ τάγματος, ὧν εἰ καὶ τὸ γένος Ἰουδαῖον, ἀλλὰ τὸ γοῦν ἀξίωμα Ῥωμαῖον ἦν, *Joseph. de Bell. Jud.* lib. ii. cap. xiv. § 9; and were generally held in high estimation. Cicero says of Verres (lib. iii. cap. 72), “Certe huic homini nulla spes salutis esset, si publicani, hoc est, si equites Romani judicarent.” Nay, the chief men of that order sought the office as honourable: “Flos enim equitum Romanorum, publicanorum ordine continetur.” *Pro Cn. Planco*, cap. ix.—“Omnes publicanos, totum fere equestrem ordinem.” *De Pet. Consul.* cap. i.

143. *Old Testament predictions of a Messiah.*

The prophecies of the Old Testament opened gradually; but though they ran through a range of three thousand years, and were delivered by various prophets, who could form no compact, they all wonderfully harmonise; and all centre, like rays converging to a point, in Jesus Christ.

When Adam was driven from paradise, it was promised that

the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, Gen. iii. 15; and Christ came to destroy the power of that old serpent the devil and Satan, 1 John iii. 8, Rev. xii. 9. To Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, it was severally foretold, that in their seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed, Gen. xii. 3, xxvi. 4, xlviii. 4; and Jacob, himself a prophet, shewed his understanding of this promise in confining to the tribe of Judah the Shiloh, the promised one, the one to be sent, and to whom the gathering of the peoples, or Gentiles, should be, Gen. xlix. 10. Moses in dying told the people of Israel, that a prophet like unto himself God should raise up, Deut. viii. 15, 18; and Christ alone resembled him in two remarkable features, — 1st, as the lawgiver of a new dispensation; and 2dly, as having personal and intimate communion with God the Father, or seeing God face to face, Deut. xxxiv. 10, John i. 45, Acts iii. 22, vii. 37, Heb. i. 1. Balaam announced a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre out of Israel, that should have the dominion, Num. xxiv. 16-18; and the same prophet foretold the death of the *only* righteous, and said he should see him, but not *then*, or not *nigh*, Num. xxiv. 17.

From the general tribe of Judah, prophecy limited the deliverer to the family of David, Isa. xi. 1, 2, 10, Rom. xv. 12, Rev. v. 5, 22-26; then Bethlehem was specified as his birth-place, Micah v. 2; and at the same time his pre-existence from eternity, yet his sojourning at Nazareth or Capernaum, on the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim, and his illumination or communication of religious knowledge to the world, are mentioned in Isa. ix. 1, 2, Matt. iv. 14-16. His teaching and miracles are predicted in Isa. xlii. 6, 7, lxi. 1, Luke iv. 18, 19. His Divinity is proved by David, Ps. cx. 1, Matt. xxii. 41 to end.

Various minor predictions relative to the Messiah's life and conversation have been recorded; so that, taking the whole together, it was impossible he could be mistaken. Such were those relating to his condition — rejected and despised, Isa. liii. 3; his humility, Zechar. ix. 9; the conspiracy of the rulers against him, Ps. ii. 1, 2, Acts i. 25, 26, Matt. xxvi. 3, 4; his triumphal entry into Jerusalem on an ass's colt, Isa. lxii. 11, Zechar. ix. 9, Matt. xxi. 1, 2, 4-10, Mark xvi. 1, 2, 7-9; chil-

dren singing praises unto him, Ps. viii. 2, Matt. xxi. 15, 16; his purgation of the temple, Ps. lxix. 9, John ii. xv. 15-17; his sufferings, Isa. liii. 7, 8; his crucifixion, Isa. lxiii. 3, xxv. 11; his being numbered with transgressors, Isa. liii. 12; yet making his grave with the rich, Isa. liii. 9; the casting of lots for his garment, Ps. xxii. 18; the refraining from breaking his legs as a part of his punishment, Exod. xii. 46, John xix. 36; his getting vinegar to drink, Ps. lxix. 21, John xix. 28-30; the piercing of his hands and feet, Ps. xxii. 16, Zechar. xiii. 6, John xx. 25-27, Luke xxiv. 39; his praying for his persecutors, Isa. liii. 12, Luke xxiii. 34; his being left to suffer alone, Isa. lxiii. 3; the fleeing of his disciples, Zechar. xiii. 7.

Thus we have brought the testimony of prophecy down to his death; but it may be pursued farther:—he would rise again ere his body should be decayed, Ps. xvi. 10; to ascend into heaven, Ps. lxviii. 18; to pour out his Holy Spirit, Joel ii. 28, Acts ii. 17; and to enter upon the everlasting dominion of the universe, Ps. lxxii. 8, cxlv. 13.

The betrayal by Judas, Ps. xli. 9, John xiii. 18; the price for which he was sold, Zech. xi. 12; the purchase of the potter's field, Zech. xi. 13; the expulsion of the traitor from the apostolic college, and the election of Matthias in his place, Ps. cix. 8, Matt. xxvii. 5; his untimely end, Ps. cix. 8, Acts i. 25, 26,—may be clearly found in ancient prophecy; and were always acknowledged by the Jews to refer to the history of their Messiah, although their prejudices refused to apply them to Jesus.

The ancient prophecies had also described John the Baptist as his forerunner, Isa. xi. 3, Matt. iii. 1-3, Luke iii. 2-4, Mark i. 2, 4, 7, 8, Luke i. 17;—his conception by a virgin, Isa. vii. 14, Luke i. 26, 27, 31, Hos. xi. 1, Matt. xi. 13, 15; his nativity, Isa. ix. 6, Luke ii. 11; his name, Isa. vii. 14, Matt. i. 22, 23; the wisdom of his youth, Isa. xi. 2, Luke ii. 42, 46, 47; his offices, Isa. lxi. 1, 2, xlii. 1, Luke iv. 11-21, Matt. xii. 17-21; his Divinity, Prov. viii. 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, 31, Micah v. 2, Isa. ix. 6, Col. i. 15, 16, Heb. i. 2, 3, John i. 1, 3, 14, Heb. xi. 3, John xvii. 5.

Besides all these particulars, which form a narrative of our

Lord's life by the inspired anticipation of centuries—a galaxy of prediction, a scattering of seed to ripen into harvest at the end of four, three, two, and one thousand years, the prophet Daniel foretold the very time at which he should appear, viz. seventy weeks of years—that is, seventy times seventy years, or, according to prophetic interpretation, 490 years—from the issuing of the Persian edict to rebuild Jerusalem after the Babylonish captivity; while Jacob had fixed the event before the sceptre should finally depart from Judah, Dan. ix. 25, 26, Gen. xlix. 10.*

Now, as the government of the Jews has for more than seventeen centuries been lost, and the tribe of Judah confounded with the other tribes; as the seventy weeks of years have long since expired; and as the temple of Jerusalem has been totally destroyed, an event which Daniel had said would happen *after* the death of the true Messiah,—all except the Jews, whose hearts the Almighty has, for wise purposes, hardened for a season, must be convinced that the Messiah has already come; that he came in the person of Jesus; that the prophecies pointed to no other; and, consequently, that no other is to be looked for, Dan. ix. 25, 26.

It may here be proper to observe, that the words *that it may be fulfilled*, *ἵνα πληρωθῇ*, so often recurring in prophecy, signify, in the judgment of the best commentators, *thus was fulfilled*. "God," says Campbell, "does not bring about an event because some prophet had foretold it; but he inspired the prophet to foretell an event he had previously decreed." The accomplishment may sometimes appear trivial, or of a strained interpretation; but the wonder consists in so large a number of small matters ordained, the seemingly fortuitous uniting of their many rays, and throughout many generations, to bear testimony to one individual, and to distinguish him from all others. The Jews,

* It is a common artifice of infidelity, to single out an individual prophecy, and to deride it, in its context, as far-fetched and an accommodation: but the force of prophetic evidence lies in the cluster and accumulation of particulars, all bearing on one point; while the remoteness of one prophet from another precluded the suspicion of a league, and the cessation of prophecy, as the time of fulfilment approached, provided against the charge of political foresight.

indeed, never question the appropriation of these smaller traits to *their* Messiah; but their understanding being blinded, they dispute their applicability to ours. Many of these prophecies, besides, had a twofold fulfilment; one in an inferior event near at hand; and this as the emblem and earnest of the remote accomplishment in the Messiah,—supporting the “deferred hope” of faith, which, not thus intermediately propped, “maketh the heart sick.”

144. *Religious sects in the time of the apostles.*

The *Pharisees*, so named from פָּרִישׁ, *to divide or separate*, stood aloof from other men, as less holy than themselves; but their holiness consisted in attention to the formalities and ceremonies of the Mosaic code, which they overlaid by the addition of vain traditions, calculated to draw away attention from the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith. By fasting twice in the week, and scrupulously paying tithe of small herbs, they threw the great moral duties into the background, and retained and cherished the vices of rapaciousness and supercilious contempt of the humbled penitent. They had no holiness of heart, no sound principle of religion within, no spirituality; but resembled platters clean only on the outside—monuments ostensibly splendid, but filled with dead men’s bones. They earnestly sought proselytes to their own wilful blindness. They believed in a future state of the soul; but rather in a metempsychosis than a conscious individual resurrection.

It is an artifice of Satan to beguile men into a persuasion, that because the Pharisees are condemned by our Saviour for their hypocrisy, we cannot separate ourselves too far from every one of their observances. Hence prayer and fasting are disregarded, and the Sabbath openly violated; and lawful tribute is refused, or grudgingly given, under pretence that these things are pharisaical. And no doubt they are so, if coupled with moral remissness; but as means of holiness, as cisterns of grace, and as compliances with the Divine law, they are essential branches of duty, concerning which our Saviour said, *These ye ought to have done, and not have left the moral duties undone.*

The *Scribes* were not a sect, but men studious of the law, who instructed the people by their explanations of it; and are sometimes called "doctors," or "lawyers." They were principally of the tribe of Levi; and in character resembled the Pharisees, with whom they are associated in our Lord's denunciations.

The *Sadducees* confined their faith to the law of Moses, excluding all other books of the Old Testament, perhaps with the exception of Joshua. They therefore said there was no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit; and thus shut out all hope of futurity of which the individual is conscious, even that of materialists, — a sect who deny a separate state of souls, yet admit that God may again breathe intelligent life into the body. Our Saviour taking up the Sadducees on their own ground, shewed that even by the Pentateuch a future state may be proved; since God, in calling himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living. How they could believe the Pentateuch and disbelieve in angels, it is not easy to determine. They denied fate, and conceived man to be left to his own free-will entirely. As they held no recompense in futurity, they were of course a licentious sect — Jewish Epicureans — boasting principally of the rich, prosperous, and unbridled in passions, as their adherents. The founder of the sect was one Sadoc, a word signifying *just*, from קִדְּשׁ, Matt. xxii. 23, Acts xxiii. 8.

God produces some good out of evil: and the effect of the contrariety of these two sects was, that when our Saviour or his apostles refuted the arguments or reproved the vices of the one, they were pretty sure of a favourable hearing with the other, Matt. xxii. 34, Acts xxiii. 7. Yet these contending bodies could unite when their own interest was concerned — as they did to put our Saviour to death; for the high-priest Caiaphas was a Sadducee, Acts v. 17. Our Lord called both *a generation of vipers*, Matt. iii. 7, xvi. 6, 11, 12.

There is mention in the New Testament of the *Herodians*, and of *Galileans*, whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices. As Herod Antipas was tetrarch of Galilee, these denominations are by some supposed to be the same — adulators

of Herod, who asserted the claims of that tetrarch to dominion under the Roman power, and justified his compliance with several heathen usages of Rome (called in Mark viii. 15, *the leaven of Herod*); such as building temples with images for idolatrous worship, *Joseph. Antiq.* lib. v. c. 12. The Pharisees, holding that the Roman power ought *not* to be recognised, came, together with the Herodians, to have that political point settled, and to entangle Him in his discourse; and as the stamp on the current coin was the token of subjection, our Lord's *Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's* (Matt. xxii. 15-22), settled the political question against the Pharisees, by recommending subjection to the powers that be, while he condemned the impieties of the Herodians.

As to the *Galileans*, it is only said by Josephus, that they were seditious, and that tumults were often stirred up by them during the great feasts in the Temple, *Antiq.* xv. 4, 7, xvii. ix. 3, vi., xvii. 10. This induced Herod the Great to build the fortress of Antonia, commanding its courts and precincts. Josephus relates that Archelaus put to death three hundred Galileans, or people from the country, at a festival, when in the act of sacrificing; and it is possible that a similar insurrection was repressed in the same manner by the Roman governor; *Antiq.* lib. ii. cap. i. § 3.

The Gaulanites were a body of Galileans, who, on the death of Herod the Great, in the tenth year of Christ, took arms under Theudas, a native of Gaulan or Golan (one of the six cities of refuge, beyond Jordan, Josh. ii. 8) — to resist paying tribute to Cæsar, as a servitude which the Jews should refuse. This insurrection began in consequence of the census set on foot by Cyrenius, and was soon suppressed, the leader being slain. They were not Herodians, Acts v. 37, ii. 2. The New Testament abounds with inculcations of civil subjection, chiefly directed against the spirit of such insurgents. The kingdom was not of this world.

The pure doctrines of the Gospel, indeed, soon after its rise, began to be tainted with errors both civil and religious, and with heresies brought into the church by converts both Jewish and

pagan. The *Nazarenes* were of the former class. This name, given generally to the disciples of Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος (John xix. 19), until A.D. 41, when they were first called *Christians* at Antioch, Acts xi. 26 — sometime afterwards became a term of reproach, as still by Jews and Mahometans. נָזִיר signifies a person separated, sequestered, consecrated to the service of Jehovah; and was marked by not shaving the head, as in Samson (Judges xiii. 5), who was a Nazarite from his birth; and in Samuel, 1 Sam. i. 11. In allusion to the former passage, St. Matthew states that Joseph dwelt at Nazareth, *that it might be* [so was that] *fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene*, Matt. ii. 23. This was a play upon the words, but established the typical prefiguration of Jesus by Samson. The inscription on the cross seems to have been written ambiguously by Pilate, to be understood in a sense of honour or of contempt; and might either be a full acknowledgment of his titles as a consecrated person and a king—though not of this world; or might suit the taste of those who scoffed at both these pretensions. The chief-priests, with their usual thickheadedness or inveteracy, wanted something more explicit; but Pilate reproved their eagerness in the words, ὁ γέγραφα γέγραφα. The vow of Paul, or of Aquila, who shaved his head at Cenchrea, was opposite to that of a Nazarite—a *votum civile*, a sign of a temporary seclusion from the world.

Properly speaking, however, the term Nazarene is restricted to the Judaizing Christians, who still adhered to the letter of the law respecting circumcision, the Sabbath, and the Jewish festivals, as binding on all converts to Christianity. This matter occasioned much division in the early church. Peter and Paul differed on the subject at Antioch; Paul justly rebuking Peter for his vacillation in personally living as a Gentile, and yet, for fear of the Jews, compelling the Gentiles to Judaize, Gal. ii. 12, Acts xi. 3, A.D. 41.

The Gentile converts of Antioch appealed to a council of apostles and elders at Jerusalem (Acts xv.); where Peter turned round, and pleaded for the entire deliverance of the Gentiles from the Judaizing yoke; while the others, like men of sense, and guided by the Spirit of God, deemed it wise to make the

innovation gradually, and not to violate at once the prejudices of the chosen people, so long accustomed to venerate the institutions of Moses; and, with this view, they only imposed on the Gentiles the abstaining from meats offered to idols, and a few other temporary restrictions in things peculiarly obnoxious to the Jews. For Moses was read in every city in the synagogues every Sabbath-day, Acts v. 20, 21. Expedience is generally dangerous and censurable; but there are exceptions, and this is one.

Paul, with the same view, directed Timothy, his disciple and a half-Jew, to be circumcised, A.D. 53; and declared to the Corinthians (1 Cor. viii. 13), with respect to eating meats offered to idols, that, though persuaded that an idol is nothing in the world, he would abstain while the world lasted from the flesh of heathen victims (which was often sold publicly after a sacrifice), rather than he would throw a stumbling-block before a weak brother, for whom Christ died.

But his general sentiment was — that the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life, 2 Cor. iii. 6; that circumcision is of the heart and in the spirit, and not in the letter; that no man should judge the disciples in meats or drinks, in holy-days or new-moons, since all that was wanted was a new creature, Col. ii. 16, Gal. vi. 15. The Judaising spirit, however, gained ground; but the general body split into the Nazarenes and Ebionites.

Among the Christians who had taken refuge at Pella from the destruction at Jerusalem were these two sects, the former of whom were only distinguished by a rigorous attachment to the ceremonies of the Mosaic law. The Ebionites were tainted with some leaven of the Gnostic heresy, which had gained ground under Simon Magus at Pella; and which, by considering the body of Christ as a mere phantom, only suffering in appearance, destroyed the doctrine of the atonement. This was the heresy of the *Δοκεταί* (from *δοκέω*, to appear); but as the bodily existence of the risen Saviour was well known, a qualified sense of the doctrine was devised, namely, that Jesus was a mere man until his baptism in Jordan, when Christ, an emanation from God, illapsed upon him, which left him immediately before his crucifixion. This notion of two distinct beings, Jesus and

Christ, was held by Cerinthus, accompanied with all profligacy and sensual indulgence.

The Ebionites, named from Ebion (which in Hebrew signifies *poor*), were Judaizing Christians; but rejecting the epistles of St. Paul, and the whole doctrine of the incarnation, they held the two beings to have been united at the baptism of Jesus; but, in contradistinction to the Cerinthians, they were particularly strict in their morals. Josephus became an Ebionite in the latter part of his life.

Besides the perversion of the Gospel by Judaizing admixtures, its purity was adulterated by paganism.

The *Essenes* had been a numerous sect of the Jews ever since the return from Babylon. They were a sequestered people, living apart from places of public resort; and it is remarkable that they are not once mentioned in the Gospels. Many writers suppose that John the Baptist received his early training among this people, about the eastern bank of the Dead Sea; a notion sanctioned by the simplicity of his food, and the place of his first preaching. This sober and industrious people had all things in common; and, while they strictly observed the moral precepts of the law, disregarded its ceremonial ordinances, except only in regard to bodily purification, a strict Sabbath-keeping, and an annual present to the Temple. They admitted no women into their communities, but adopted and educated children committed to their care, and thus kept up the numbers of their society. The education imparted in their schools was that of pure and strict morality, with admonitions to preserve the books of their masters and a register of the names of the angels. There is much to admire in this contemplative and self-denying sect, who opened a communication with the invisible world, and fled from the temptations of the crowd. A detailed and interesting description of them is given by Prideaux, *Connexion*, vol. iii. p. 450.

The Essenes were free from the infidelity of the Sadducees, and the rigid legal *outside* observance of the Pharisees; and consequently came not with these sects under the condemnation of our Saviour: nay, if John were an Essene, he inclines to them by coming to his baptism; though he silently rebuked

them by his encouragement of cheerful entertainments, and rendering himself useful to his brethren by intermingling in the world — a field of zeal to those who are delivered from its evil. The Essenes deprived themselves of this active utility. They borrowed from the East a transcendent spiritual philosophy, which led to the undue mortification of the body, for the entire purification of the soul from the influence of matter, which in every form was deemed evil. They worshipped angels as mediators; and attributed a mystical sanctity to the number seven. They were the germ of the monastic orders.

These errors, being infringements on the pure doctrines of the Gospel, which was fitted for the walks of public life not less than the solitudes of retirement, are frequently condemned by the apostles; and particularly the Epistle to the Colossians, and the 1st Epistle to Timothy, are considered as levelled against them. There the superiority of Christ to all angels is insisted upon; while the ultra-rigorous observance of Sabbaths, the forbidding to marry or touch certain things, and the exercise of a voluntary humility, which worships angels, are condemned. While excess in the indulgence of appetite is censured, Timothy is enjoined to use a little wine, for the stomach's sake and frequent infirmities. Bodily exercise, or reduction by fasting, is said to be of little profit (in *itself*, and except as a means of spiritual discipline) towards the salvation of the soul. The philosophy which inculcated these things is termed false and spoiling; and Hymenæus is delivered over unto Satan for his denial of the resurrection of the body, Colos. ii. 16, xx. to end, 1 Tim. iv. 7, 8, 12, v. 3, 1 Cor. viii. 8, Rom. xiv. 17.

The *Gnostics* are not mentioned by name in the New Testament; yet their heresy, borrowed from the school of Alexandria, soon infected the purity of the Gospel with a fatal leaven, which produced many errors, mixing up a hash of Judaism, heathenism, and Christianity. The Gnostics taught, as their name implies, that they alone possessed the true knowledge of Christianity; which they corrupted by false notions about the origin of evil and the creation of the universe. They taught that the Supreme Being, who inhabits space, or the *πλήρωμα*, was not the creator of the universe, and that matter was co-ex-

istent with him and eternal; that he produced a multitude of *æons*, or emanations, by one of whom, a demiurgus (operator on matter), the world was created. These emanations are what St. Paul calls genealogies, and against which he warns both Timothy and Titus, 1 Tim. i. 4, Tit. iii. 9. These notions led the Gnostics to deny the divine authority of the books of Moses, who says, that in the beginning God (the Supreme Being) *created* the heavens and the earth. They taught that evil resided in matter, and that the malignant author of the world sought his own glory rather than the advantage of men. The body, then, as part of matter, they despised, denying its resurrection and reunion with the immortal spirit. They attributed diseases and calamities to evil demons, and applied themselves to magic in order to counteract their influence. They considered Jesus Christ as the Son of God and inferior to the Father; who came into the world for the deliverance of mortals, oppressed by matter and evil beings, the works of the demiurgus; but they denied his humanity as something belonging to matter, and many of them disputed the reality of his sufferings. The Gospel and Epistles of John were directed against their errors; and yet they lauded the introduction of the former, as favouring their phantasies in the phrases *the world, life, light, &c.* They divided men into three classes, 1st. The material, who were incapable of knowledge, and doomed to perish; 2d. The spiritual, or Gnostics, who would infallibly be saved; and 3d. The physical, animal, or intermediate, who might be saved or damned, according to their works. From these premises, opposite moral conclusions were derived. Some thought, by rigid abstinence and bodily mortification, to emancipate the soul from the incumbrance of the material frame. Others maintained that there was no moral difference between the (so-called) good and evil actions of men; and thus gave loose to unbridled licentiousness. Of these last were the *Nicolaitans*, censured in the Revelations (ii. 6, 15), as belonging to the churches of Ephesus and Pergamos. These derived their name from Nicholas of Antioch, a Gentile, who first embraced Judaism and then Christianity, and grafted on both the extravagant and criminal errors of the Gnostics. Of these, Jude writes (ver. 4), *there are certain men crept in unawares, who*

were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ. And St. Paul speaks of another branch of their heresy (1 Cor. xv. 12), *Now, if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?*

145. *Supplemental passages in the Pentateuch not written by Moses ;—when, and by whom?*

When it is said (in Deut. xxxiv. 5-8) that Moses died in Moab, and was buried there, and mourned for thirty days by the Israelites, it is very plain that this could not come from his own pen, but with the rest of the chapter, stating that no prophet arose since in Israel like unto Moses, &c., must have been attached to the roll by some one after his decease. The ninth verse renders it likely that the writer of this appendix was Joshua—to stamp its authenticity, as added by one full of the spirit of wisdom, and elected to the leadership by imposition of the hands of Moses. But the latter words were probably annexed by Ezra, who wished to shew, under the guidance of inspiration, that (though in the succession of generations many eminent prophets had arisen) the prophet like unto Moses, promised by God in Deut. xviii. 18, was not yet come, no one of the four greater or nine lesser having seen God face to face.

It has been objected by unbelievers, that the occurrence of the words *Dan*, *Hebron*, the *tower of Edar*, in the Pentateuch, discredit its genuineness as the work of Moses, these names having been given to the places after the entrance into Canaan; before which time *Dan* was Laish, *Hebron* Kirjath-arba, and the *tower of Edar* a tower on the gate of Jerusalem. To this it has been answered, that the new name may have been given by a transcriber when the old one had become obsolete, without impeaching the credit of the author: as Bishop Watson instanced concerning Havre de Grace and Havre Marat, in his answer to Paine.

That which is said respecting the translation of a word may be applied to a short parenthesis or explanatory clause, which may, at first, be inserted by a transcriber in the margin of the

copy, and subsequently creep into the text, as if originally part of it, and supposed to be the slip of a copyist. This, therefore, may be said of Exod. xvi. 36, *an omer is the tenth part of an ephah*, with the whole of the preceding verse. Dr. Graves has shewn that the narrative describing the manna terminates at the thirty-fourth verse, with the command to Aaron to preserve a portion of that heavenly food. The two following verses are a subsequent insertion, probably by Samuel; as Graves conjectures that the pot of manna was lost when the ark was taken by the Philistines. Yet he is unwilling to drop the omer as the tenth part of an ephah, since Moses may have had an eye to posterity, as in Num. iii. 46, *the shekel is twenty gerahs*.

Num. xxi. 3, describing the conquest of the Canaanites, is plainly parenthetical, and added by Joshua. Num. xii. 3 is marked as a parenthesis, and is unconnected with the text: it is a character of Moses, given probably by Joshua, who knew his meekness. But Dr. A. Clarke contends for the word *meek* being a mistranslation of מַלְּץ, which signifies *oppressed*, or *depressed*.

Again, Gen. xxxvi. 31, we read of a king of Edom *before a king reigned over Israel*; which, together with Deut. iii. 14, *Bashan-havoth-jair is called after Jair, the son of Manasseh, unto this day*, must have been written after the time of Moses. Answer:—these passages are *manifest* insertions, and unconnected with their immediate contexts. Here, as in the manuscripts of the New Testament, explanatory words and clauses (spurious additions) have been written in the margin by some transcriber, and drawn into the text by another. Such explanations, rendered necessary by lapse of time, prove the antiquity of the original. Horne gives two examples, *Introd.* vol. i. p. 75. Le Clerc made a selection of seventeen such interpolations, cited by cavillers as condemning the *genuineness* of the Pentateuch; but Dr. Graves has given a satisfactory solution of them all, vol. i. p. 322. Witsius, Huet, Carpzof, Mildenhawer, Graves, and Horne, have answered the objections of Le Clerc; but the best authority is his own, for he not only abandoned, but refuted them.

Witsius ascribes such trifling nibblings to a *prava carpendi*

libido. But which is the fairer reasoning?—to question the general genuineness of the Pentateuch on account of a parenthesis; or to question the genuineness of the parenthesis itself?

"There is nothing new under the sun," may be especially said of the cavils of infidelity. They have been cribbed and pilfered over and over again, without acknowledgment, and (to use a phrase of Dr. Johnson's) by a perpetual repercussion from one coxcomb to another. Paine attacks Moses for speaking of himself in the third person; which would apply to the genuineness of Thucydides, Xenophon, Cæsar, and Josephus. But this was not understood by an illiterate egotist, who knew nothing about Cæsar and Xenophon, and who set himself up as wiser than the wise of eighteen centuries.

Some objections are to be ascribed to ignorance of Hebrew. עֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן is not BEYOND *Jordan*, but literally OVER *Jordan*, and may be applied to either side of that river. *Over* is *ober* in German; and Aberdeen or Aberistwyth is the town built *over* the river Dee or Istwyth. Witsius, on a review of the whole argument, allows of only four interpolations; and these either consisting of the change of a word, or of a slight historical memorandum.

146. *Inspiration of the Scriptures proved from prophecies.*

Miracles and prophecy, the two external evidences of Christianity, rest their claims on an appeal—the former to the omnipotence, the latter to the omniscience of God. The working of miracles and the gift of prophecy may, it is true, be deputed to men, whom the Spirit of God may make the channels of his communications and powers; but if so, what such favoured individuals declare concerning God's dealings is to be received as absolute truth, since God is truth, wisdom, and holiness, and would never give them such powers in order to mislead mankind. *Believe what I say, for my works' sake*, was an unanswerable argument. Miracle proves the power of God in the moment of performance; but prophecy proves his omniscience by its fulfilment. *Prophecy* may have, and has in many cases, a first and inferior fulfilment, as an earnest and assurance of its

grand and ultimate fulfilment. The prophecies of Scripture are not appendages to the narrative, which might prove, when fulfilled, their own separate inspirations, but not the general authenticity of the sacred records : they are inlaid, interwoven, and almost identified with the whole.

The prophecies of the Old Testament relate, partly to the fates of kingdoms which, from their neighbourhood, affected the fortunes of the Israelites—Egypt, Babylon, Nineveh, Tyre, Edom, Arabia,—and partly to the Messiah, or great Deliverer; the anticipation of whom was kept up during many centuries by a chain of prophets, writing in different styles, and different ages and circumstances, yet all taking the same view of one great subject, and perhaps some of them ignorant of the full drift of many of their expressions; too remote from each other to be in human compact, yet all marvellously consistent in their announcements. All these prophecies have been fulfilled, or are now in the course of fulfilment; yet they were too distant from the events, particularly those relating to the Messiah, to be the mere product of sagacious forecast; and they were too minute in their detail of particular circumstances, birth, character, place, time, miraculous agency, sufferings, resurrection, ascension, and the consequences of the whole, to be either conjectures, or to be fulfilled *because* the prediction put it into the head of an individual to accommodate his conduct to their details; for we have already shewn that *ἵνα πληρωθῇ* has no such meaning. It was necessary and wise that some of the prophecies should be clothed in ambiguity: as an exercise of faith (our life being a probation of conviction as well as of morals, that is, of decision between probabilities and anti-probabilities); as sheltering the heralds of God's will from the personal vengeance which might be consequent upon their speaking truth; as avoiding the giving of a handle to wicked kings for gratifying their own ambition and lust of conquest by what they would consider a compliance with the word of God. These causes, together with the figurative Oriental style of many prophecies, seem to cast some cloudiness around them, but not so much as to render their meaning doubtful even to the Jews, who admitted their applicability to their Messiah, but, their minds

being darkened, denied their application to Jesus. The prophecies, therefore, were themselves inspired; and, as they were interwoven like a gold thread in the whole tissue and web of the sacred volume, prove the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures at large: they prove, that unless a man be convinced by Moses and the prophets, a miracle would not persuade his evil heart of unbelief; they prove, not only that God spake to our fathers in time past by the prophets, but moreover, that *all* Scripture is given by inspiration of God.

A miracle is a communication of supernatural power; a prophecy is a communication of supernatural knowledge. When a miracle accompanies prophecy, it affords ground for faith in the prediction, even *before* the accomplishment, soothing the impatience and quelling the doubts of expectation. A prophecy without a miracle, but delivered by a holy character, is ground of an inferior expectation of the accomplishment. Speaking of prophecy in the abstract, the *issue* (though far off by ages) must be abided as a seal of its truth. The fulfilment shews that the person who uttered it *was* inspired by God, who alone knows future events. But it is likewise a proof of that prophet having been inspired in other instances in which he claimed inspiration—a proof of his having a Divine mission for the purposes for which he asserts that he has it; for when a prediction accomplished (says Gerard, *Evidences*, p. 279) shews a person to have had supernatural knowledge in that instance, it would be offering violence to the understanding, not to believe such doctrines (undiscoverable by reason) as he publishes along with the prediction, and affirms to be revealed by the same God, and for the truth of which affirmation he appeals to his predictions. What this author says of doctrines, is true respecting precepts and historical narratives. He says, he is taught of God in regard to them all. The proof of fulfilment confirms his declaration as to *prophecy*: it thus commands implicit trust as to the whole. Therefore, either miracles, performed along with the prediction, or the predicted events happening at the time of accomplishment, being evidences of veracity in asserting *prophetic* inspiration, are, still farther, evidence of the veracity of the prophet in asserting the *general* inspiration of his writings.

147. *How far was metempsychosis a doctrine of the Pharisees?*

The doctrine of *metempsychosis* was borrowed by the Jews from paganism. It belonged to the Egyptian and Brahminical, and most probably to the Syrian and Babylonian idolatries, and was implied in the rearing of altars to the departed, and worshipping them in groves and high places. They expected Elias to return in the person of a herald of their Messiah. From the prophecy of Malachi (iv. 5), *Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord*—the same person who is called the *messenger*, chap. iii. 1, —the Jews to this day earnestly pray for the coming of Elias, who is the forerunner of their Messiah, according to a form of prayer recorded in their liturgies. Elias appeared in *person* to fulfil, even literally, this prophecy, before three chosen witnesses, at the transfiguration. But these apostles were commanded to tell the vision to no man before the resurrection of their Master; and the other disciples asked, immediately after that vision, *Why, then, say the scribes that Elias must first come?* Matt. xvii. 10. Our Saviour then opens the spiritual meaning (verses 11, 12), which had been more fully, yet privately, revealed to Zacharias by the angel—that John should go before the Lord in the *spirit and power of Elias, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord*, Luke i. 17. With truth, then, did our Saviour say that this (John) was Elias, in the *spiritual* sense of the Gospel, without sanctioning the Pharisaical notion of metempsychosis; and with equal truth did John deny he was Elias in that *literal* sense, while he yet pronounced himself to be the forerunner of the Messiah, whose shoes he was not worthy to bear—the voice of one crying in the wilderness, *Make straight the way of the Lord*; in fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah, chap. xl. 3.

Commentators have run a parallel between Elias and John, both sent in troublous times, and commissioned to reprove wicked princes; both living sparingly in a wilderness; both clothed alike, and in emblems of poverty. *Elijah, a hairy man, girt with a leathern girdle*, 2 Kings i. 8; John, with a raiment

of camel's *hair* and a *leathern girdle* — the decoration or meanness of the girdle measuring in the East the condition of the wearer—the outside of the purse denoting its contents. Both were jealous for the Lord of hosts, 1 Kings xix. 20; and both turned many to the Lord, Luke i. 16.

That the Pharisees held this doctrine of transmigration as confined to the souls of the good, appears from Josephus (*De Bell.* lib. ii. cap. 8, § 14), "They say that all souls are incorruptible, but that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies; while the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment." Such was the doctrine of the Pharisees; and Josephus declares of himself, that he gives his hand to the Romans, not as a deserter of the Jews, but because God had chosen him to be the vehicle of a soul of prophecy; *De Bell.* lib. iii. cap. viii. § 3.

The question, *Did this man sin, or his parents, that he was born blind?* seems to intimate a belief in the penal nature of afflictions in this life for transgressions committed in a previous state of being; but Lightfoot and others deny this application.

It certainly contradicted the passages, *Every one of us shall give an account of HIMSELF to God*, Rom. xiv. 12; and that which all the Jews allowed, *a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and UNJUST*, Acts xxiv. 15, Dan. xii. 2, John v. 28, 29; *wherein every man shall receive according to HIS works*, Rom. ii. 6, &c.; *whether good or bad*, 2 Cor. v. 10.

The question of the Jews, however, seems to refer to the second commandment; and that the sins of parents are even here visited upon the children, we see to be a fact in hereditary diseases and family dishonour. Eccles. xi. 18 is cited from the Apocrypha, to shew the opinions of the Jews; but *that a man is known by his children*, is nothing but a truism.

We now see the reason why the Jews asked John the Baptist whether he was Elias, or *ὁ προφήτης*, by which some explain Jeremiah; but from John vi. 14, and Acts iii. 23, it can signify none other than Christ in his prophetic character, *THAT prophet which should come into the world*. The Pharisees believed in a return to earth of Jeremiah and the other prophets, Matt. xvi. 14. Did not the exclamation of Herod, *This is John the*

Baptist; he is risen from the dead, intimate something more than the wildness of a troubled conscience?

148. *The three Creeds.*

I. THE APOSTOLIC CREED.

Ruffinus and other writers consider this creed to be the joint composition of the apostles, each contributing a sentence; whence its name *symbolum apostolicum*, symbols being the proportion of every one in a reckoning. But none of the apostles speak of such a joint production; and though the early Fathers maintain its conformity with the apostolic doctrine, they do not mention it as an apostolical composition. There were various creeds in the first three centuries, and all of equal authority; though some omitted the descent into hell or hades, and others the communion of saints. We cannot ascertain the author of the apostles' creed, nor its precise date; but it certainly preceded the third century, being found in its present form in the writings of St. Ambrose in the fourth century. It is mentioned by Amalarius A.D. 880, as following the Lord's Prayer in the *Saxon* offices; and was the primitive creed of the Italian church. Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. ii. p. 233.

II. THE NICENE CREED.

The Nicene Creed is a paraphrase on the formulary drawn up at the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. This exposition was published by the second Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. It speaks more largely and distinctly concerning the Divinity of Christ than that of the apostles had spoken, and condemns various heresies. In the English Church, it precedes the sermon; in the ancient church, it followed. In the one case, a warning to the preacher; in the other, a corrective of any error in his doctrine. Palmer's *Orig. Liturg.* vol. ii. p. 56, &c.

III. THE ATHANASIAN CREED

Is a formulary of faith, said to have been drawn up by Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, to vindicate himself, before the emperor Constantine, against the calumnies of his Arian enemies. Vossius, however, A.D. 1534, was the first who denied it to be the

work of Athanasius, shewing it to be a Latin composition, written by a Roman author, and not bearing date earlier than the year 600. He says it was not cited as the work of Athanasius until the year 1233; but Usher maintains it to have been cited under the name of that prelate 400 years earlier, and dates it earlier than A.D. 447. Quesnel ascribes this creed to Vigilius Tapensis the African, in the fifth century; and in this opinion most divines coincide. This creed was received in France, Spain, Italy, and Germany, from 850 to 950; and was sung, in alternate verses (*ἀντίφωνα*), in England in the 10th century.

Waterland attributes this creed to Hilary, bishop of Arles A.D. 430; but contends that it was called the Catholic Faith, or the *Quicumque*, till a little while before A.D. 670, when the name of Athanasius was called in to adorn it.

149. St. Paul's arguments for the unity of God, and against idolatry, deduced from natural religion.

When the idolatrous people of Lystra would have offered sacrifices to Paul and Barnabas, the former, addressing them on principles which they could understand, called on them to turn from their vanities to the one living and only true God, who made heaven and earth, and all things that are therein, and who is therefore the rightful object of their worship—not men, of like passions with themselves. This God, in time past, suffered all nations to walk in their own ways, for wise reasons; one of which was, that they might see the feebleness of their reason, and their want of a revealed religion. Yet their idolatry was never necessary, and always absurd; for reason might have convinced them of the unity, power, and goodness of the invisible Deity, by the witnesses of his unity, power, and goodness, set forth by himself,—his giving us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, and filling our hearts with food and gladness. In the first and second chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul shews that a certain, though imperfect, portion of natural religion was written in the understandings of the heathens. Again, in addressing the Athenians respecting their altar to the unknown God, he leads them to the invisible Being, whom, amidst the idolatry of the popular religion, the philoso-

phers and reflecting men acknowledged, the *Ζεὺς πατήρ*, in whom we live and move; and quotes their own poet Aratus, who was, like Paul, a native of Cilicia,—“For we are also his offspring,” *ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν*, Aratus, *Phænomena*, v. 5.

150. *The atonement is a motive to obedience.*

God sent his Son to be a propitiation for us. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another, 1 John iv. 10, 11. *Shouldst not thou have had compassion on thy fellow-servant, even as I had pity upon thee?* Matt. xviii. 33. *Hereby we perceive the love of God, because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren*, 1 John iii. 16. *Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?* Rom. ii. 4. *We love him, because he first loved us. Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, &c. let us draw near with faith, and hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; and consider one another to provoke unto love and good works.*

151. *Grace and holiness.*

The doctrine of grace strengthens the obligation to personal holiness. I fall into a pit; I cannot help myself out; I feel my inability, and I call for assistance. A stranger holds out his hand, and says, “I will draw you forth; but I expect you will shew a willing mind, by doing what you can.” What is this but another version of the text, *For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure; wherefore work out your own salvation with fear and trembling?* Philip. ii. 12, 13.

The doctrine of grace, as implying spiritual influence, is founded in the original depravity of man. *Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God*, 2 Cor. iii. 5. *Now, God will not withhold his Holy Spirit from them that ask it*, Luke xi. 13; but even to ask it, though prompted by Him, is an exertion, and implies an option. It is *ours* to use means, by God’s command, and by God’s help: it is *his* to give the increase. But, on receiving spiritual influence, we must remember our responsive duty;

which is, *Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby we are sealed to the day of redemption*, Ephes. iv. 30. We are not to *quench the Spirit*, 1 Thess. v. 19. *We then, as workers together with him, beseech you that you receive not the grace of God in vain*, 2 Cor. vi. 1.

Redemption by Christ, as well as sanctification, is part of the doctrine of grace; and we know that Jesus Christ died for us, *that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works*, Titus ii. 14. And again, *they which have believed in God should be careful to maintain good works*, Tit. iii. 8. Faith is the hand by which we lay hold on redemption, in order to obtain justification; for we are *justified by faith*, Rom. v. 1; but it is by *faith which, through sanctification, worketh by love*, Gal. v. 6; it bringeth forth good works, as a tree its fruits, James ii. 18; and unless it be thus manifested, it is a dead faith, or, rather, no faith at all.

152. *The facts of Gospel-history confirmed by profane authors.*

Suetonius, Tacitus, Pliny, Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, are not only profane authors, but enemies or traducers of Christianity. Suetonius writes (A.D. 68, *Nero*, cap. xvi.): "*Afflicti supplicii Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ et maleficæ.*" He also mentions the general tradition, already stated, *that a party coming from Judea should possess the empire of the world*; and relates the siege of Jerusalem, and the triumph of Titus at Rome.

Tacitus, mentioning the burning of Rome by Nero, and his persecutions of the Christians, as the pretended authors of the fire — "*Quietissimis pœnis affecti, quos per flagitia invidos, vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, qui, Tiberio imperante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. Repressa in præsens exitiabilis superstitio, rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judæam, originem ejus mali, sed per urbem,*" &c. *Annal.* lib. xv. cap. 44. Tacitus died A.D. 99.

The next witness is the younger Pliny, whose celebrated letter to Trajan (A.D. 106) when he was proconsul of Bithynia,

gives an account of the third persecution of the Christians, and beautifully describes the innocence of their lives and habits; on which account he has evidently a favourable leaning towards them. He professes ignorance of this *superstitionem pravam et immodicam*; and asks whether the mere name of Christian, without any fault, ought to expose individuals to capital punishment. "Affirmabant enim hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem; seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent: quibus peractis, morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coëundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium." *C. Plin. Traj. Imp. lib. iv. cap. 97*; Lardner's *T. H. Testimonies*, and Bryant on the *Scriptures*.

Celsus, a heathen philosopher, wrote a book against Christianity in the second century and reign of Adrian (A.D. 118 to 138, soon after the death of St. John), the title being "The True Word," ἀληθῆ λόγον; which was answered by Origen — the attack being dated early in the second century, and the defence in the third. The work of Celsus is lost; and we only know it from the quotations and refuted passages in the reply. From this we learn, that there were passages in Celsus concerning the expectation of a Messiah, and the pretenders who appeared; references to the Gospels, and other books of the New Testament; statements of the facts and principles, and of the worship and progress of the Gospel. "It is but a few years," says he, "since Jesus delivered this doctrine, who is now reckoned by the Christians to be the Son of God." He admits the miracles, but attributes them to magic. He has eighty quotations from the books of the New Testament, of which Origen has taken notice.

Doddridge states, that an enumeration of the particulars in the life of Christ mentioned by Celsus would almost form an abridgement of the evangelist's history; beginning with the star in the east, and the slaughter of the innocents; and reproaching Christ, if he were indeed divine, with not exerting his power to prevent the evils and indignities which befell him.

Celsus, according to Bryant, quotes and alludes to many passages of the Old and New Testament. This author speaks also of Christ and his incarnation, of his being born of a virgin, and his flight into Egypt; acknowledging that his disciples looked upon him as a Divine personage, and accordingly worshipped him as the Son of God. Celsus alludes frequently to the Holy Spirit, and mentions God under the title of the Most High; and speaks collectively of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as a matter of doctrine transmitted by the evangelists. He does not deny the miracles wrought by the apostles. Lastly, the crucifixion of our Saviour, his death, resurrection, and subsequent appearing to his disciples, together with the darkness and earthquake at his decease, are all particularised by Celsus. It is true, he continually objects and disbelieves: but those very objections prove that these histories and doctrines existed, and must necessarily have been antecedent to his cavils; which is all that we want to know from him.

To pass by Lucian (A.D. 180), and Galen (A.D. 193), and some others of the second century, we close this article with the mention of Porphyry and Julian. Porphyry was a pupil of Longinus, who flourished in the third century. He wrote a book against the Scriptures, which was burnt, in the following century, by order of Constantine, and afterwards by that of Theodosius the younger. He admits the working of miracles by the apostles, but ascribes them, like Celsus, to magical arts. This was the common excuse for refuting the Gospel, supported as it was by these wonders, which could not be controverted. But it is thought that these writings would have perished without edicts, so general was the contempt in which they were held by Christians. Our Lord himself had anticipated the answer: If Beelzebub support the cause of God and morality, how shall the kingdom of Beelzebub stand?

Julian mentions Paul by name, and treats of the first chapter of St. John. While he speaks contemptuously of Christ, as having made a few proselytes from among the dregs of the people, and as not having been known for more than three hundred years, he admits the cure of the halt and the blind, and the exorcism of demoniacs at Bethesda and Bethany. His whole

book is a bitter invective against the Christians. He admits the holy life of the Christians, and holds up their charity to imitation. Their zeal, their fortitude, their pure notions of religion, receive his honourable mention.

To these quotations the testimony of Josephus may be added, who speaks of Christ's miracles and resurrection. And finally, we subjoin, that the more pure than pagan ethics of Seneca (A.D. 65), Epictetus, and Marcus Antoninus (A.D. 161), have every appearance of being plagiarisms from the Gospel.

153. Resemblance between the institutions of the Levitical law and the religious ceremonies of the Gentiles.

The original revelation came by immediate communication from God to our first parents, by whose descendants many of its institutions must have been imparted to the nations, after the dispersion from Babel. Of this description was the institution of the Sabbath, or consecration of a seventh day, prevalent over all the Asiatic nations; as also the offering of sacrifices, and the law of blood for blood. As the emigrations wandered more widely from the central point, or had greater difficulties to contend with, or were insulated by woods, swamps, and rivers, from their neighbours, or led a nomade and pastoral life, several of these observances must have become more faint, and some utterly lost. The notion of the unity and spirituality of God became absorbed in idolatry, mixed, however, with rites which had still some reference to the original tradition. When God, then, gave Moses the Levitical law, if some institutions tallied with those of the heathen, he only laid claim to his own primitive communication; and as in sacrifices, which were typical, or offerings, which were acknowledgments of the Giver of all good, or purifications, which were at once connected with health and inward cleanliness, restored to these ordinances their pristine and true application. In other respects, where institutions thus borrowed from original revelation were perverted among the heathens, and closely interwoven with gross error or with dishonour to God, a positive opposition to such perversions was signified. Thus the worship of the serpent, and the Egyptian superstition in *preserving* the red heifer, led in the Mosaic law

to an abhorrence of the serpent, and a burning of that animal, whose ashes, purified with water, and devoted to God, yet sanctified the unclean, Heb. ix. 13.

On the other hand, many heathen institutions were borrowed from those of Moses, and idolatries helped out by pilferings from the volume of truth. Whether circumcision was borrowed by the Jews from the Egyptians, or by the Egyptians from the Jews, is of little moment, as it is not necessary to invent the symbol of a covenant. The rainbow was in the cloud before the flood; and the signs of the Gospel-sacraments were the ordinary elements of nourishment. The memory of the deluge is preserved in all countries; and a chest, or ark—the vehicle of the Divinity—gives a twofold meaning to the Jewish ark of the covenant. S. Faber's *Origin of Heathen Mythology*; Bryant's *Mythology*; Roberts' *Illustrations of Scripture*.

Sir William Jones shews the Hindoo cosmogony to be borrowed from that of Moses; and their temples, like most heathen, had an outer and inner apartment, like the *sanctum* and the *sanctum sanctorum*. Faber's *Cabiri* and *Horæ Moisaicae*; Wiseman's *Lectures*.

154. *I believe in the holy Catholic Church.*

“*Ecclesia Christi visibilis est cœtus fidelium, in quo verbum Dei purum prædicatur; et sacramenta, quoad ea quæ necessario exiguntur, juxta Christi institutum, recte administrantur.*”—Art. xix.

This nineteenth article ought to be compared with the twenty-third, which declares, that only those may *preach and administer the sacraments* who are *lawfully called and sent*: “*per homines, quibus potestas vocandi ministros, publice concessa est in ecclesia.*”—Art. xxiii.

As church is *κυρίου οἶκος*, and *ἐκκλησία*, from *ἐκκαλέω*, *a calling forth, an assembly*, any congregation in which there is lawful preaching of the pure word of God, and the sacraments are rightly administered, is *a church*. But we read of many of these congregations or churches in one place, and they are then, when united under one superintendent or bishop, called the church of that place. The Corinthian

women are commanded to keep silence in the churches, in an epistle which is dedicated to *the church at Corinth*. Now, as several united churches fall under the jurisdiction of a bishop, and are called *one church*, we have only to suppose all the churches or dioceses in the world as *united* under one head, Christ the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls, and we have arrived at the idea of the Catholic or universal church. But this church must be holy, as it must be really a bond of unity; holy, because it separates its disciples from the world; holy in its instituted offices. The component parts of this church may differ as to ceremonies, without forfeiting the character of its holiness; but there must be *unity* in all matters prescribed by Scripture, and particularly in the leading doctrines, which are called *essentials*: one faith, one Lord, one baptism, one hope of common calling; because the whole is *one body*, animated by one Spirit, Eph. iv. 4-6. *That they all may be one, even as Christ and the Father are one*, John xvii. 21. Such was, in fact, the primitive church: they all prayed in one temple, and broke bread *with one accord*, Acts ii. 46.

It is not necessary that every individual member of this Catholic church should be holy, because it is the *visible church*, and man can judge only by the *profession*. God knoweth those who are his own; he alone can discern the inwardly holy, the sincere—who are *his elect*, and constitute the *invisible church*. Both must grow together unto the harvest, and then the separation will be made. Still the church, generally, must, now and here, be holy in its principles and professions.

Respecting the comprehensiveness of the Catholic church, opinions are yet farther divided. Some persons, referring to the phrase, *Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named* (Ephes. iii. 15), mingle angels with men under the category; but others imagine that it can only, in strictness, include those for whom Christ died; and this seems the sentiment of the parties who compiled the creed, as they make the communion of saints (which may include the holy angels) a different article from the holy Catholic church.

Others enclose within the fold all who profess to believe the Gospel—even Socinians and rationalists, who deny the Lord

that bought them. Others, again, give the name of the church to all who bow the knee at the name of Jesus, that is, who confess his Divinity, Phil. ii. 10: *all who in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours*, 1 Cor. i. 2. And this they think to be a fair definition of the Catholic church, which includes the churches of Scotland, Holland, and Geneva, together with the large bodies of pious, and, in point of doctrine, orthodox dissenters. It chiefly includes many members of an episcopal church, who, rejecting divine right, do yet regard episcopacy with reverence, as ancient, lawful, and expedient.

But that body of divines who are usually called the *high-church party*, insist upon it that this latitude of definition violates the nineteenth and twenty-third articles of our church, and excludes one essential point of unity—unity in government and discipline. Any congregation, they say, is excluded from the Catholic church, wherein the sacraments are not duly administered by persons *lawfully called and sent*; and they will allow of no *lawful* calling, as a vehicle of grace in the sacraments, save that which is transmitted by imposition of hands, from age to age, in unbroken succession from our Lord and his apostles: that of those “called to this work by men publicly authorised to send ministers into the vineyard.” Art. xxiii.

The main inconvenience of this opinion, not to say *objection* urged against it, is its making doctrine bow the knee to discipline. Its holders cannot, in point of discipline, deny the idolatrous church of Rome to be part and parcel of the Catholic church; while, in point of doctrine, it is allowed to be anti-christ, the scarlet whore, and the mother of abominations.

But what, say they, must be done? Are we to rely on fallible reason, and to forsake Scripture?

No man taketh this honour upon himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So Christ also glorified not himself to be made an high-priest, but He that said unto him, Thou art my Son; to-day have I begotten thee. And again, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedeck, Heb. v. 4-6, Exod. xxviii. 1, Ps. ii. 7, cx. 4.

Thus it was evidently intended, that, so far as a commission

to teach went, the church of Christ should bear some analogy to the patriarchal and Jewish institutions, as directed and ordered by God himself. Now, this commission comes from the higher to the inferior power, and, as an outward symbol of the grace and benediction conveyed by it, has been, since the days of the apostles, imparted by imposition of hands. This was the method of conveying other blessings, even in the earliest days—as Jacob laid his hands on Ephraim and Manasseh; and Christ, under the Gospel, laid his hands *upon little children, and blessed them*. When he gave his commission to his apostles, *he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: as my Father hath sent me, so send I you*, John xx. 21, 22. Thus commissioned, the apostles appointed others to the ministry, by imposition of hands. *Then laid they hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost*. To ordain by breathing on them, belonged only to Him from whom personally the Holy Ghost proceeded. To ordain by imposition of hands, was the humbler form adopted and instituted by the authorised channels of communication. And that it descended from them to their successors, is evident from Paul's direction to Timothy, *to lay hands suddenly on no man*, 1 Tim. v. 22, iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6. *The things which thou hast heard of me amongst many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others*, 1 Tim. ii. 2. This commission implies an authority to judge of the qualifications; and that authority, derived from those authorised, in succession to convey it. From this apostolical practice, derived from men sent forth and ordained by Christ himself, the custom has accordingly descended from age to age, down to the present day.

But as this is allowed by Presbyterians and other congregations, who practise laying on of hands by a *presbytery*, and so claim to belong to the holy Catholic church, it is next maintained, that these do not fulfil the necessary qualifications, as not being persons *lawfully called and sent*, by men—i. e. by the lineal successors of the men—to whom the power of calling ministers into the Lord's vineyard hath been publicly committed in the congregation—ἐκκλησία.

Here, then, arises the question—whether the apostolical

succession involves not the episcopal succession. Those who are called the *low-church party* adopt episcopacy as a matter of *expediency*. The high-church body consider it, in all its ramifications, and in the efficacy it conveys to all the ministerial services in the church which flow from it, as the authorised channel of covenanted grace. They plead the pattern and platform of the Jewish church having a high-priest—a type of Christ, the great High-priest. They plead the descent of the episcopal government from Christ himself, the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls; his sending forth twelve apostles, and seventy minor ministers, in allusion to the priests and Levites of the law, or perhaps to the tribe-chiefs and sanhedrim. They maintain that the apostles became bishops, having the power of ordaining to the ministry—that is, of appointing men to administer the sacraments—exclusively committed to them, from the moment of their Master's leaving the earth. They plead the prescriptive claim of the fifteen hundred first years of the Gospel—the “quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,” &c. (*Vincentius Lirinensis*)—to the appointment of those who shall perform the ecclesiastical functions; and affirm, that all who enter the fold by any other door are not authorised shepherds. They see no difference between ecclesiastical services performed by them and those performed by laymen equally sincere; and therefore exclude them and their congregations from Christ's visible church.

To ward off the imputations of unworthiness in the conveyers or receivers of this grace, they who are termed the high-church body respond, We have the treasure in *earthen* vessels; and the pure stream is not affected by the ruggedness of its banks. And, aware of the charge of uncharitableness towards conscientious dissenters, they reply, That *they* themselves are equally conscientious in defining the church, not by the views of men, but according to Scripture. Such, they say, are the terms of the covenant; and as for those who close not with them, we condemn them not: we leave them, according to their degrees of voluntary ignorance or of sincerity, to the uncovenanted mercy of God. And we need be in no concern about the objection that we include the popish idolatrous church in our definition of the word church;

for, whatever it may be in discipline, it is corrupt in doctrine; and accordingly comes not within the terms of the nineteenth article, which requires, that to make a congregation part of the church of Christ, "the *pure* word of God must be preached."

The Roman Catholic church has no claim to the title of the *holy* catholic church. Roman Catholic, indeed, is an absurdity in terms—it is *particular general* (as Swift said); and it is not the *holy* catholic church in which we believe, for its enormous perversions in doctrine deprive it of that title.

155. *Arrange the twelve minor prophets into three classes, as they prophesied before, during, and after the captivity, Christ being born A.M. 4004.*

I. *Before the Captivity.*

	B.C.	A.M.
Jonah,	between 856 and 784	3148 and 3220
Amos,	— 810 — 785	3194 — 3219
Hosea,	— 810 — 725	3194 — 3279
Joel,	— 810 — 660	3194 — 3344
Micah,	— 758 — 699	3246 — 3305
Nahum,	— 720 — 698	3284 — 3311
Zephaniah,	— 740 — 609	3264 — 3395

The first carrying away into Babylon—from whence the seventy years commence, and when Daniel, Shadrach, &c. were removed thither—happened 606 B.C., in the reign of Jehoiachim; the second captivity, and the taking of Jerusalem, 588 B.C.; and the first return, 536 B.C.

II. *During the Captivity.*

	B.C.	A.M.
Habakkuk,	between 612 and 598	3392 and 3406
Obadiah,	— 588 — 583	3416 — 3421,
between the taking of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Edomites.		

III. *After the Captivity.*

	B.C.	A.M.
Haggai,	between 520 and 518	3484 and 3486
Zechariah,	— 520 — 518	3484 — 3486
Malachi,	— 436 — 397	3568 — 3607

156. *What is the essential difference between a sacrifice and a rite?*

A rite is an external act of religion, designed to increase the solemnity of divine worship, and to be emblematical of the inward purity, or awe, or seriousness, or orthodoxy, of the worshipper.

A sacrifice is a surrender of something to God, in acknowledgment of his providence and goodness, or in propitiating his power and justice. The essential difference between these two things then is, that in a sacrifice something is *parted with*, and, for the most part, offered on an altar.

Sacrifices have been divided into *bloody* and *unbloody*; they have also been styled *expiatory* and *eucharistical*. The former, in both cases, were, under the law, types of the one full and sufficient sacrifice. Rites are symbolical, but not typical, i. e. not *prophetic* symbols. Circumcision is a rite, signifying the circumcision of the heart; and baptism denotes inward purification. Bowing at the name of Jesus, the cross in baptism, the ring in marriage, were rites condemned by the puritans as superstitious and popish; but defended by the orthodox, as significant of spiritual import, and on the principle that every church may appoint its own rites and ceremonies.

157. *“Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years,”* Exod. xii. 40.

We find that the period of bondage in Egypt—that is, from the entrance of Jacob and his family to the Exodus—was not more than 215 years. The whole sum of years is therefore to be dated from the call of Abraham, from which date to the entrance of Jacob and his family into Egypt exactly other 215 years elapsed.

A.M.	B.C.
2183	1921, Call of Abraham.
2298	1706, Entrance of Jacob into Egypt.
2513	1491, Exodus.

That the commencement of the covenant with Abraham is the beginning, and the Exodus, or giving out of the law, fifty

days after the Exodus, the end of the 430 years, is evident from Gal. iii. 17, *the covenant which the law, 430 years afterwards, cannot disannul.*

Stephen, in Acts vii. 6, quotes Gen. xv. 13, where 400 years only are mentioned; but it is clear that in both passages this is only a round number, as Josephus writes it, although in another place he has 430. The words of Gen. xv. 13, *they shall afflict the Israelites*, are conceived by some commentators to allude, not only to the Egyptians, but to the Edomites and Canaanites: but the 430 years terminate at the Exodus, before they came in contact with Edom and Canaan.

158. *Is the language of the New Testament to be understood in a strictly logical or a popular sense?*

The New Testament was not intended to teach worldly science, and illustrates its arguments by accommodation to popular opinions prevalent at that time, and to the imperfect science of that age; but in a manner which would not bear strictly logical investigation.

Thus, to compare the corruptible mortal body to the incorruptible resurrection-body, by the analogy of one star differing from another in glory, is an ingenious illustration, but not exact, since the difference of one star from another is not a difference in substance, but a difference of distance.

So again, to represent God as making one vessel to honour and another to dishonour, would seem, when applied to souls, to make him the author of evil, and to sanction the doctrine of unconditional reprobation. But though this illustration may be used in speaking of the power and wisdom of God, it is not logically correct in its application to the souls of men, which, unlike the potter's vessels, have reason and will, and may close with on the one hand, or reject and grieve on the other, the movements of divine grace.

159. *"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God;" — the kind and degree of inspiration.*

The inspiration is plenary as to the doctrinal *matter*, in the amplest sense, but left free, for the most part, in regard to the

expressions, which may be those suited to the genius and style of the writer. In prophecy, in mysteries, and in the revelation of such matters as human research could not of itself discover, holy men of old time spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. In matters of history, and in the narratives of ordinary events, the inspiration is that of superintendence, the Spirit of God only guarding against error by the prevention of any *material mistake*; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 2 Peter i. 21, Heb. i. 1.

160. *Is our assent to the Homilies and Canons required by the Church to the same degree as it is to the Articles and Rubrics?*

The *articles* and *rubrics* in the liturgy are both of them part of the statute-law of the realm. The articles, originally made in convocations A.D. 1562, and republished with the royal authority, are required to be subscribed and assented to by an express Act of Parliament, 13 Eliz. cap. 12, &c. A.D. 1571.

The first draught of the liturgy was issued in the King's Primer, A.D. 1545. It was improved, under Edward VI., in 1547, 1548, and 1551. Another review took place on the accession of Elizabeth, 1558; another in the first year of James I., A.D. 1603; and it attained its present state after the Restoration, December 20, A.D. 1661, when, being brought into Parliament the March following, A.D. 1662, it was established by the celebrated *Act of Uniformity*, 13 and 14 Chas. II. cap. 4. The *rubrics* are the directions, originally printed in red letters.

The *canons* were published in convocation A.D. 1603, and issued, with his majesty's authority, under the great seal; but they have never been confirmed by act of parliament. It has been decided, that, when allowed by general consent, and not repugnant to the laws or to the royal prerogative, canons are valid as to the clergy; but those of 1603, having never been established by act of parliament, do not of themselves bind the laity.

The First Book of Homilies was originally drawn up under Edward VI., and published, with the second book, by Elizabeth, assisted by her privy council, who directed both to be read in all churches, except where there was a sermon. Assent to the doc-

trines contained in both is implied in the thirty-fifth article, and they are there appointed to be read in churches by the ministers, "that they may be understood by the people." But they are no otherwise enforced by statute.

161. *In the Apostles' Creed, is the clause, "He descended into hell," of as ancient usage as the rest? Give a summary of Bishop Pearson's arguments on this subject, mentioning the three principal texts used as proofs that Christ actually did descend into hell.*

This clause, "He descended into hell," was not introduced into the creed till four hundred years after Christ; but the doctrine is nevertheless to be believed, because its truth may be proved by Scripture, and it is mentioned by Ignatius, Clement, and other fathers.

Three texts are brought forward by Burnet, as usually urged in proof of the descent into hell. The first is Ephes. iv. 9, *Now that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth?* But Pearson thinks that this means no more than a descent upon earth, this lower world. The second text is drawn from 1 Peter iii. 18, 19, *Christ was put to death, but quickened by the Spirit, by which he went and preached to the spirits in prison.* These words are construed in their literal and obvious sense by Horsley, Bloomfield, and others; although Pearson doubts this application. Christ is not supposed to have preached repentance to these *spirits*, for that would come too late; and as prison means *safe-keeping*, it is to those who *had in life repented*, that he told of his conquest over the grave.

The third text, however, Pearson thinks decisive, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption*, Acts ii. 25, 31; for that God would not leave the soul of his holy one in hell, is a proof that it *was* there; and as this was not previously to his death, it must have been during the interval between his death and resurrection.

It seems surprising that the strongest passage in proof of this doctrine should have been omitted, *This day shalt thou be with*

me in paradise. Calvin and Beza thought that Christ suffered the pains of the damned to complete the work of redemption; others, that he went only to *paradise*, the upper and happier region of *hades*. *It is finished*, were his last words on the cross, and could only mean the work of redemption, thus and then completed.

It only remains to be ascertained what is meant by *hell*. עֵשֶׂת־לֵבַי, or ἄδης, is the invisible place, the state of departed spirits, both good and bad.

The Jews thought, that, on the separation of soul and body, the body was interred in a cave of the earth, and the souls of all men conveyed into ἄδης. This place of spirits had two receptacles—one for the good above, and the other for the wicked beneath, separated by a great and impassable gulf; and here both in consciousness awaited the resurrection. *The gates of hell* are the sepulchre, which is the entrance to both receptacles; and when it is said, *these gates shall not prevail against the Gospel*, it is meant that death itself shall not stay the body of Christ from bursting its bonds, or exclude believers from the kingdom of heaven. Our Lord, in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, accommodates his words to this notion; but as he did not disclose points of mere curiosity, he has not told us where is the place of departed spirits; only disclosing the assurance of an intermediate state of enjoyment to the righteous, and of suffering to the wicked, between death and the resurrection.

The Nicene creed has the burial, without the descent into hell; the Athanasian creed, the descent into hell, without the burial: but as it is in this last case to *hades*, the invisible place, *ad inferos*, the lower regions of the earth,—it is ambiguous whether both these creeds had not the same meaning. Both clauses in the Apostles' creed are first found, according to Pearson, in the creed of Aquileia: *sepultus—descendit ad inferna*, Bingham interposing “et.” ἄδης was, even among the heathens, a place of *conscious* existence:

κάν ἄδου δέμοις
εὖ σοι γένοιο.

EURIP. *Alcest.* l. 642, ed. Monk.

162. *Is there any foundation for the Jewish expectation of a double Messiah—one to redeem, and the other to suffer for mankind.*

Dulness of understanding, unable to reconcile passages which described the Messiah as a magnificent conqueror, travelling in the greatness of his strength, whetting his glittering sword, and wearing many crowns, with others which portrayed him as despised and rejected of men, lowly and of no reputation, not having where to lay his head, and led like a lamb to the slaughter,—invented these two separate redeemers: but all those passages denoting power and grandeur are to be taken in a metaphorical and spiritualised sense—the enemies to be subdued being sin and death; and the armory, the breastplate of righteousness, the sword of the Spirit, and the helmet of salvation.

There is no mention made of a double Messiah either in the Old or the New Testament. All the prophets look forward to one only; and the evangelists mention that one as Jesus, the Word who was with God, the Son of the virgin, the Lamb slain, worthy of eternal praise. There is *one faith, one baptism, one Lord* (Ephes. iv. 5), at whose name every knee in the universe shall bow in subjection and adoration, Isa. xlv. 23, Philip. ii. 10. *This is the stone which was set at nought by you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved,* Acts iv. 11, 12. *For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus,* 1 Tim. ii. 5. *For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many,* Matt. xxiv. 5.

The following passages identify the Messiah as combining the magnificence and strength of the conqueror with the righteousness and suffering of the redeemer:—*Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?—this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength. I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. I have trodden the wine-press alone, and of the people*

there was none with me. I looked, and there was none to help ; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me, &c. &c. Isa. liii. 1-7.

163. Ἰδὼν τοὺς αὐλητάς, Matt. ix. 23. *Was the λύρα used on occasions of sorrow? Literal translation of the following passage :—*

ὁ καλλιβόας τάχ' ὑμῖν
αὐλὸς οὐκ ἀναρίαν
ἰάχων καναχὰν ἐπάγεισιν,
ἀλλὰ θείας
ἀντίλυρον μούσας.

SOPHOCLES, *Trachiniæ*.

“The beautiful-sounding flute will shortly respond to us, emitting a strain not unpleasing, but emulating the divine muse.”

Αὐλός is a wind-instrument, from αἶω, *to breathe* ; as *flute* comes from *flatus* : or it may be derived from the Hebrew לָלַץ, *to be perforated*. It is either a fife or flute, probably the latter, as more accordant with mourning, on the occasion of the text under consideration. That the Phrygian, Carian, Mysian, and Lydian flutes, were instruments in common use at funerals, either as exciting sorrow by their plaintive tones, or as denoting the departure of the soul to a place of eternal harmony (a breath of music, to waft the spirit aloft), authorities from the Greek dramatic poets, Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, might be adduced to prove.

The λύρα was proper only for the lighter poetry and cheerful songs, and not used at mournful solemnities.

Beausobre says the flute was sounded at the death of infancy (as in the case of Jairus's daughter), and the trumpet at that of old age—the latter probably to signify joy for the spirit's release from the load of mortality. Hence, we suppose, St. John says of Babylon, *the voice of harpers and musicians, and of PIPERS AND TRUMPETERS, shall be heard no more in thee, αὐλητῶν καὶ σαλπιστῶν* ; Jer. ix. 17, 2 Chron. xxxv. 25.

164. *The first principle on which the authority of Scripture depends.*

All Scripture is given by INSPIRATION OF GOD, 2 Tim. iii. 16. Holy men of God spake [as they were] moved by the Holy Ghost, 2 Peter i. 21. God, who dictated the Scriptures, is all-knowing. In his knowledge (including prescience), truth, wisdom, holiness, justice, and love, we have assurance of the reliance to be placed on his word.

165. *Testimony of heathen writers to the sufferings of the early Christians : its value.*

They had every prejudice against the doctrine. They were the persecutors of those who preached it. They were long ignorant even of its spiritual character, and deemed it a branch or sect of Judaism, which they despised, hated, and maligned. In a civil point of view, they saw impiety in the setting forth of strange gods, and sedition and commotion in the preaching of the apostles, saying, *They that have turned the world upside down, have come hither also, Acts xvii. 5.* As the Pharisees knew it would be a cogent argument with the Roman power, to say of the Master of the house, *He stirreth up the people (Luke xxiii. 5),* so was it an argument of heathens with the colonial magistrates against the apostles, *These men, being Jews, do exceedingly trouble our city, and teach customs which are not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe, being Romans, Acts xvi. 20, 21.*

What prejudices must have arisen among an idolatrous priesthood, numerous, and connected with the best families, at the introduction of a pure religion, which was to overthrow every altar, and would submit to no compromise ! How would all those who lived by the disposal of innumerable victims raise a cry of feigned zeal, but real starvation ! and how would the chorus be joined by all the lovers of the fine arts, architects, sculptors, medalists ! who would doubtless exclaim, with one voice, against the approach of barbarism, and the decay of refinement, taste, genius, and virtue (i. e. *vertù*). How few

would have the candour to add the real to the ostensible motive for opposition, which, nevertheless, slipped out from the lips of one silversmith, *So that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought, (the real); but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised and her magnificence destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth, (the hypocritical).* The tradesmen in such places of general resort would be up in arms, and loud and frequent would be the bursts of zeal and avarice; while the philosophers, trembling for the overthrow of their systems; and the priests, making a stand for their occupation and gods; and the luxurious, hating a religion which aimed at curbing their unruly passions; and the soldiers, who lived by war, abhorring the message of peace,—would present a phalanx of opposition to the simple, unsophisticated, unworldly, self-denying, holy religion of Jesus;—and under such circumstances it is needless to observe, that any testimonies to the fortitude, the constancy, the sincerity of those converts who broke through all these obstacles—to the invincible perseverance and miraculous patience with which they endured the cruel attempts to exterminate or suppress them; nay, that confessions of their multiplying beneath the sword of persecution, and exhibiting few instances of recantation, or fear, or silence—that such testimonies, coming from writers partaking of all these prejudices, carry with them the force of entire conviction.

If our evidence had come only from the *friends* of the Gospel, scepticism would have found ground for distrust. But when enemies and persecutors allow of the charity, the exemplary lives, the universal benevolence of the Christians—when they speak of the rapid progress of [what they call] the new and pestilent superstition in the first and second ages of the Gospel, while they mourn over desolated temples and a sword fruitlessly drunk and weary with slaughter,—who so obstinate as to shut his ears to this unwilling testimony?

166. *Had the Jews, at the time of Christ's crucifixion, the power of life and death?*

In matters relating to their own laws this power seems to

have been left to the Jewish rulers, but subject to the assent of Roman governors, who might be placed, with the guard of personal responsibility, in provinces; which was necessary to counteract, by severe justice or well-timed lenity, the rigour of municipal laws, or the too-indulgent caprice, or the overbearing madness of the people. *Knowest thou not*, said Pilate to Jesus, *that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?* John xix. 10. *We have a law*, was the clamour of the Jews, *and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God*, John xix. 7: this was no reason for the jealousy or interference of a Roman governor; but the lie, that Jesus had forbidden paying tribute to Cæsar, and the half-lie, that he had called himself a king, were sufficient to make the wavering Pilate dread the consequences of his steady refusal to put an innocent prisoner to death. *If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend*, John xix. 12. He tries to shift the odium from himself, *Take ye him, and judge him according to your law*, John xviii. 31; but they tell him, *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death*, ver. 31: and then followed the last parley of this weak governor with his faltering conscience, the symbolical washing of his hands, to signify that the expediency of pleasing the people was a violation of his sense of right; and it was met by the horrid imprecation,—the prophecy so fearfully fulfilled, *His blood be on us, and on our children!*

Thus, in matters of sedition, insurrection, murder, robbery, and in transactions merely civil, the power of life and death was retained in the hands of the Roman governor, while he might sanction or reverse sentences unconnected with these charges. Observe, the Jews at first said, in their sanhedrim, that Jesus, accused of blasphemy, was worthy of death; but, being doubtful about Pilate's assent, they altered their course into a charge of insurrection and treason, of stirring up the people, and speaking against Cæsar: and if Pilate had not pleased them by condemning his meek and guileless prisoner, they would, no doubt, have accused Pilate himself to Cæsar, as the patron of a traitor.

167. *The words in Matt. xvi. 28 have been referred, 1. to our Lord's transfiguration; 2. to his ascension; and, 3. to the destruction of Jerusalem. What are the arguments in favour of each interpretation?*

1. The argument for his transfiguration as fulfilling the promise, is taken from its following in the immediate context as a regular sequence. Our Saviour speaks in the plural number, *τινές, some shall not taste of death until THEY shall see* (ὡς ἂν ἴδωσι) *the Son of man coming in his kingdom.* One only of the apostles saw the *destruction of Jerusalem*, and he could not be denominated by *some, τινές, &c.* Peter, James, and John, were sufficient witnesses to their Master's glory; and a *specimen* of the kingdom of God, in power and in glory, was surely afforded in the law and the prophets bending to the Gospel, in the garment of light and sun-bright countenance of Jesus, in the persons of Moses and Elias, and in the voice from heaven, declaring, *This is my beloved Son—hear ye him.*

2. Those who refer the words to the *ascension* of our Lord, adopt the more remote proof as more important than the near specimen; and, although they might be met by another grammatical objection—for instead of saying *τινές, some*, our Lord would have mentioned *all*—they might reply, that the previous death of Judas was here a bar to his literally mentioning “all.” It was after our Lord's ascension, when he poured out the Holy Spirit, that the kingdom of God came with power, *ἐν δυνάμει*; and if we attend to our Lord's declaration at the last supper, *I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom*, which can only refer to a communion with him after his ascension, through the Spirit, it is fair to consider the kingdom of God, in the passage under consideration, as having the same meaning with that in the latter instance.

3. The third interpretation is embraced by Whitby, Porteus, Mant and Doyley, and other divines, who solely confine the passage to the approaching destruction of Jerusalem. They chiefly support their opinion by the words which occur in the heart of the prophecy respecting that catastrophe; *And they*

shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory, Matt. xxiv. 30: this, they say, cannot be a digression or moral from the previous description, because it is not until the fourth verse afterwards that we read, *Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled*, ver. 34.

The first of these three interpretations is, in the writer's judgment, the most probable. The Jews entertained a notion that the destruction of their city and temple, and the end of all things, were to happen at the same time. This appears in their question, *When shall these things be?*—i. e. the destruction of the Temple and subversion of the Jewish economy—and *what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?* Matt. xxiv. 3. Our Lord answers these questions by a prophetic announcement of the time when the former event should happen, and an ambiguous leaving in uncertainty that *other day* and hour, to be distinctly apprised of the *time* of which, would destroy the duty of watchfulness. In other respects, there seem to be gleams of allusion to the day of judgment in the prophecy relating to the Temple, as if the one were typical of the other, and as if both kindred events occupied the Saviour's mind at the same time. *That day* emphatically and constantly signifies the day of general judgment.

168. *Objections of the Samaritans to receive Jesus with hospitality.*

When Salmanezar carried captive the ten tribes into Assyria, he peopled the vacant country with strangers from the east, who provoked heaven, by their idolatries, to punish them; and, the cause of this visitation being suspected, Esarhaddon sent a Jewish priest to instruct them in the religion of the country; to which the dregs of the Israelites, not carried captive, contributed. The version of the Scriptures at this time used by their descendants is in the Samaritan character, and remains to this day. A mongrel religion now started up, half idolatry and half Judaism; but by the time of the return of the Jews from Babylon, they had parted with their idols, and desired to be joined to the restored captives in rebuilding the Temple, but were repulsed as not pure

descendants of Abraham. This rejection laid the foundation of the hatred which prevailed between the Jews and Samaritans even down to the time of our Saviour. The Samaritans obstructed the rebuilding of the Temple, by accusing the Jews to the Persian monarch of disloyal designs. They likewise erected a temple for worship according to the Hebrew ritual on Mount Gerizim, to which they changed the name *Ebal* in their own Scriptures. Such were the Samaritans, with whom the Jews had no dealings; and who were, as a people, not behind the Jews in reciprocated rancour, as appears in the conversation of our Lord with the woman of Samaria at Jacob's well. There were individuals, however, among the Samaritans, charitable, devout, and grateful; and our Saviour, in his parables and sayings, labours to remove a prejudice against them from the hearts of the Jews. Though he defends the chosen people, as the church of God, and knowing what they worship, while he condemns the Samaritans as schismatics, who had got up an altar of their own, and worshipped they knew not what, he candidly allows their individual holiness, in the story of the ten lepers and the parable of the merciful Samaritan, predicting an approaching time when those distinctions of ordinances should be abolished, and God the Spirit every where be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

169. How did the church of Rome tamper with the commandments?

The church of Rome has struck the second commandment quite out of the Decalogue; and, to make the number complete, has split the tenth into two. This last it has done in imitation of the Jews, who, however, combined the second with the first.*

* The second commandment is, however, inserted in the Douay Bible, though with a note that it is not *graven images*, but *image-gods*, that the commandment is directed against—as if they did not bow the knee to saints and the virgin! The Decalogue is not an arbitrary division. The Jews called the commandments the Ten Words; and they were written on two tables, comprising love to God and love to our neighbour.

170. *God created man in his own image, Gen. i. 27.*

This is the state in which Adam was created and lived before the fall, having a disposition and will conformable to those of God. It is the state to which it is the office of the Spirit of God to restore fallen creatures, *born in sin, and by nature the children of wrath*. It is the state of renewal after the moral likeness of God, of being *renewed in the spirit of our minds, putting off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and putting on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness*, Ephes. iv. 22-24.

171. *What general considerations concur in proving the truth of the Gospel-history?*

The long existence of a religion wherein the one invisible God was worshipped, and a code of comprehensive precepts delivered, in the midst of a whole world sunk in darkness and in the grossest idolatries; an altar at which philosophy lighted its torches: this religion in the custody of a people stiff-necked and despised, and in all other affairs of life not marked by talent or possessed of science; the miraculous continuance to the present day of a people of peculiar features, which stamp them as of one family in all the lands of their dispersion;—this, I say, is a most marvellous fact. Their religion involves a system of prophecies, with their sister dependencies, *types*, which all harmonise, though, on a hasty glance, contradictory and inconsistent in some respects; all unite in pointing forward to a Deliverer, who should bless the whole human race. These prophecies could not result from a combination to impose an opinion upon the world, for the writers were scattered over two thousand years. This book of prophecies was closed nearly three hundred years before the birth of those who fulfilled them; that later prophecies might not seem wise opinions or shrewd guesses as to future probabilities. They were translated out of Hebrew into the Greek of the Septuagint B.C. 284; and they were in the custody of Jews, the inveterate enemies to Christianity. These (the Jews) prize the sacred deposit; although, judicially blinded, they misunderstand its contents, looking forward to a different

fulfilment; but the prophecy of Daniel, which limits the time of fulfilment to seventy weeks of years, and to the time when the second temple should be standing, shuts in their hopes. The volume is in their own keeping, in the keeping of adversaries, who acknowledge its genuineness and authenticity, and glory in its revelations: but the time is past, the true Messiah is cut off; and their expectations of any other are for ever precluded.

Wise, too, was the delay and propriety of the time at which it was appointed that the Messiah should come. The scheme of prophecy had had time to ripen, and natural religion to shew its inadequacy to satisfy the anxieties of men, until truth shone amidst *moral* darkness, though not amidst the darkness of blind credulity, and challenged the inquiry of an enlightened age. Intelligence and philosophy had had opportunity to try their hands at making a system of principles and theory of happiness, and had failed in the highest age of refinement and secular wisdom. The Messiah then appeared before the arena of a world; some resisting him as an impostor, and some opposed to a self-denying religion; but all sunk in an abyss of religious ignorance and hopelessness, all lost in the grossest vices, and all requiring a heavenly guide. He appears, poor, lowly, unpatronised, and unprotected. His religion, by the swordless agency of twelve poor followers, makes its way suddenly—like fire in a pine-forest—over all the civilised world, propagated by the bold assertion of these men that their Master wrought miracles, and rose after death from the sepulchre—an assertion supported by their personal sufferings and endurance unto death, and for which no motive of interest to speak falsely can be imagined. Idolatry is laid low; and ten persecutions only serve to multiply the myriads of willing victims. The moral system of this religion was indeed entirely beautiful, and bore marks of Divinity; but that could not of itself have made such swift and wonderful way. Heathen writers and Christian fathers confirm the apostolic narrative; and the blood of an army of martyrs flows. An unheard-of revolution is effected in the world. The Gospel,—though more slowly after the cessation of miraculous gifts,—makes its way, in the course of centuries, till it is at length

printed in one hundred and fifty languages. Preachers are in all lands; and still it spreads, and promises universal dominion. Is not this religion from God? Is it not a new birth of the world? Is not the Bible-history true?

172. Genealogy of Herod the Great, and division of his kingdom by his will.

Herod the Great was the son of Antipater, a powerful Idumean: his brothers were Phasaël, Joseph, and Pheroras; and his sister was Salome. He had several wives, and children by all of them; but his favourite consort was Mariamne, of the Maccabee or Asmonean family. Some think he was a Jewish proselyte; but he evidently cared little for the law of Moses; and was never liked by the chosen people, although he beautified and almost rebuilt their decayed temple. Dissensions having arisen between the two sons of Alexandra, of the Maccabee family, Antipater excited Hyrcanus, with whom he had been brought up at her court, to recover the high-priesthood from his younger brother Aristobulus, the favourite of Alexandra; and through the medium of his connexion with the royal family, and of personal services to Cæsar, after Pompey had reduced Jerusalem, he obtained for his son Herod the government of Galilee, from which that intriguing prince advanced under Augustus to the throne of the entire tributary kingdom.

Herod, after a life of tyranny and cruelty, finding his death approaching, and having five days before killed his eldest son Antipater, changed his will, and left Judea to Archelaus, son by his wife Mandane; the Gaulonites, Trachonites, and Batanea, to Philip, own brother to Archelaus; and Galilee and Peræa to Herod Antipas, his son by another wife, Cleopatra, and called in Scripture *the tetrarch*.

173. "I became all things to all men," 1 Cor. ix. 22.

In the conduct of St. Paul we perceive the latitude and limits of expedience, which were in him an accommodation of his conduct, in indifferent matters, and so far as he could with a safe conscience, to the notions, feelings, and even prejudices of those whom he addressed. Did he seek to gain the Jews? He

forbore declaiming against their law, but shewed the Gospel to be its sequel and fulfilment, exhibiting it in the light of a school-master to bring men to Christ, which conformed its outward forms with its hidden meanings in the heart,—the letter which killeth, with the Spirit which giveth life. Though released from the bondage of the Mosaic law, he submitted to it in some things—as in his circumcising of Timothy, and his accomplished vow in the Temple (Acts xxi. 26),—that he might not shock the prejudices of even unconverted Jews. Had he to deal with newly-made converts among his countrymen, who were still inclined to Judaizing under the Gospel? He speaks of the law of ordinances as blotted out; of the handwriting as nailed by Christ to the cross; of the middle wall of partition, the *chel*, as broken down; of a new and living way provided within the veil. Yet he subscribes to the apostolic decree enjoining that the converted Israelites should abstain from things strangled, and from meats offered to idols, and from fornication, and from blood; and this in order to avoid giving offence to the Jews, who heard Moses read in their synagogues in every city. Did Paul seek the conversion of the Gentile idolaters? While he tells them to turn from their vanities unto the living God, he falls in with, and applies the uninspired notion of a Being, the Father of all, the Chief of gods and men, who made heaven and earth, who in time past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways, and yet never left himself without a witness, in doing good to men and giving rain and fruitful seasons, Acts xiv. 15, &c. Did this great apostle of the Gentiles desire, without compromising his principles of eternal truth, to convince the philosophers of Greece? As they had said, with a deistical sneer at the idolatries of their own city, that this babbler seemed to be a setter-forth of strange gods, *ξένων δαιμονίων*; he replies—in words falsely rendered *too superstitious*—"I perceive that this people is too much addicted to *demon-worship* already," *δεισιδαιμονεστέροις* (so far this gratified the Epicureans and Stoics); "but I see one altar to the *unknown God*; whom, therefore, ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you." This was probably an altar raised by these philosophers, that they might at once seem to comply with the popular religion, and yet hold their own

natural theology in reserve ; or, however reared, it was an altar of which they might avail themselves for the exercise of a seeming devotedness to the religion of their country, and their indulgence of a secret scepticism. And this gives Paul an opportunity of taking up the ground of natural religion, as preparing the way to Christianity ; decrying the idolatry of a city, where it was said proverbially that it was more easy to find a god than a man, and extolling the one invisible, omnipresent God, the Father, the Maker, the Preserver of all ; who hath made of one blood all nations of men ; who is to be worshipped with a spiritual worship ; who winked at the ignorance which worshipped idols in time past, but who now commanded all men every where to repent, and who hath declared himself to be accessible to repentance. It is not possible to conceive a more rhetorical way of gaining the good-will of an audience, than this of coinciding with their [so far correct] opinions on natural theology, and in their condemnation of the popular superstitions. It is no wonder that, up to this point of his address, he was heard by these philosophers with partial attention. Thus far, then, in every sense, Paul was made indeed *all things to all men*. Nor did he lose favour with this audience till, having gained this advantage, he proceeded to introduce the Christian doctrines ; and although he cautiously and partially laid down the ground and motive of repentance, with as little repulsiveness as possible to the prejudices of his hearers, by proclaiming a day of judgment assigned to that *man, ἀνδρὶ*, whom God hath ordained, yet not being able to conceal the assurance given of the doctrine by the resurrection of Jesus, at his first mention of it, these philosophers, who never dreamt of a resurrection of the *body*, took offence. They were, however, staggered, and not undivided ; for though some mocked, others promised a future hearing.

At Corinth, though Paul disapproved of the tumult and licentiousness which must have attended the Isthmian games, he addressed his arguments and metaphors to the people from these their favourite amusements — running, wrestling, and pugilism.

At Jerusalem, when a mixed concourse were inveterately bent against him, he perceives that they are composed of two

contending parties, and he dexterously avails himself of the difference to break the force of the assault, and to turn the attention of the assailants away from himself, by setting them one against another. *But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee : of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And there arose a difference between the Pharisees and the Sadducees ; and the multitude was divided, Acts xxii. 6, 7.*

He gains upon Felix, and makes that undecided governor tremble, and even put the pleader off with a promise of re-hearing—not by broaching the peculiar doctrines of Christianity at first, but taking an allowed ground, by speaking concerning morals and the responsibility which should produce them, temperance, righteousness, and judgment to come. He gains upon Festus, a Gentile and a Roman judge, by denying that he had done any thing against Cæsar, and appealing to Cæsar himself in answer to the pompous accusation of Tertullus, that he was a mover of sedition—the only ground of accusation of which a Roman tribunal would care to take cognisance. He gains upon Agrippa, by complimenting his knowledge of the prophets, his Jewish opinions, and his belief in a resurrection ; and when he sees that prince's mind trembling in the balance, and almost persuaded, this eloquent apostle and accomplished advocate throws in the delicate compliment, *I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am, except these bonds, Acts xxvi. 29.*

Paul was indeed *all things to all men*, that he might gain some. If Tyrannus, in whose school Paul disputed two years, was a rhetorician, he was an excellent master.

174. *Apocryphal and canonical books of Scripture.*

Canon, in Greek κανών, is a word derived from קנה, *a reed*, which the Jews made into an instrument for measuring buildings, 1 Kings xiv. 13, Isa. xliii. 3. It thus gave metaphorically name to a moral rule ; and hence the written word of God, as the rule of faith and obedience, is called canonical. The canon of the Old Testament, or catalogue of inspired books, collected

by Ezra (as is believed), contained—the law, the prophets, and the hagiographa; and to this threefold division our Lord refers in Luke xxiv. 44, *things written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms*, the Psalms being the most important and prophetic book of the hagiographa, which also included Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Ruth, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, with the two books of Chronicles or Paralipomena, reckoned as one book. According to Jerome, the number of books in the canon amounted to twenty-two, corresponding to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet; though now they are in twenty-four divisions. These were the books received as canonical in the church until the middle of the third century, when the Council of Carthage took in the apocryphal books, which the Council of Trent long afterwards ordered to be received as books of holy Scripture upon pain of anathema, not only incorporating but intermingling them with the inspired writings.

The canon of the New Testament, however, declared by the Council of Carthage, entirely agrees with our own; although some ancient churches at first entertained doubts respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, the 2d of Peter, the 2d and 3d of John, Jude, and Revelation. A manuscript of the second century was found by Muratori in 1740 (see Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. iv.), in the Ambrosian library at Milan, its list of books tallying with ours, with the exception of one of the Epistles of St. John. The disputed books were cited by writers of the second and third centuries, and are now generally received, the temporary hesitation shewing the extreme care taken in the adoption of writings. The catalogues of canonical books delivered by Origen A.D. 210, Eusebius and Athanasius in 315, Epiphanius in 370, Jerome in 382, Augustine in 394, agree with that now received in the church.

Apocryphal books, from ἀποκρύπτω, *to conceal*, are those either rejected as spurious or not acknowledged as divine. Most of these books were the work of Jews in the century before Christ. Some of them, as Tobit, Susannah, and (as it is called by Jerome) the *fable* of Bel and the Dragon, &c. are religious romances. Some of the books contain false doctrine, as, praying

for the dead, praising suicide, &c.; and some are distinguished by anachronisms. The best book, Ecclesiasticus, professes to be only a compilation, translated into Greek by the grandson of the compiler; yet nothing can be purer morality, or more instructive and unobjectionable matter, than that book and the Wisdom of Solomon. Tobit is contemptible, and Judith full of blunders. The apocrypha is never quoted by our Lord or his apostles, or alluded to by Josephus or Philo, or any father of the first three centuries, or mentioned in the New Testament. No one of its books exists in Hebrew, or was received by the Jewish church, or known to it. Wisely, therefore, does our church determine, "that the church doth read the apocryphal books for example of life and instruction of manners, but doth not apply them to the establishment of any doctrine." The supposed song of the three holy children in the furnace of Babylon, is introduced into our liturgy.

As these books never existed in Hebrew, they were never recognised by the Jews; and are unnoticed by the Septuagint. Even in the fifth century, they were read by inferior officers and in a lower part of the church. Origen, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and the other orthodox writers who have given catalogues of the canonical books, unanimously reject the apocrypha. And the Protestants generally admit into the canon of Scripture such books only as were received in the first ages of the church, such as are cited by the earliest Christian writers as of divine authority, and were allowed, after minute inquiry, by the Council of Laodicea A.D. 366, which makes no mention of the apocrypha.

Again, the apocryphal books were written after the days of Malachi, when, according to the universal testimony of the Jews, the spirit of prophecy had ceased; and not one of them makes pretensions to inspiration. They contain fables, lies, and contradictions. The Maccabees bear internal marks of incorrectness: Antiochus, for example, is made to die three different ways; first, in his bed at Babylon, 1 Mac. vi. 8, 16; secondly, stoned to death in the temple of Nanea in Persia, 2 Mac. i. 16; and, thirdly, falling from his chariot in the mountains, 2 Mac. ix. 7, 28. In England a few chapters of these books are read for instruction: in other Protestant churches not one of them

is noticed. It is singular, that while we adopt these spurious productions, the 1st and 2d Books of Chronicles are not admitted into the lessons in our public service.

175. "*I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.*"—NICENE CREED.

Sin is either original or actual; and baptism is administered either to infants, who have the taint of the first, or adults, who labour under both. When the former are baptised, it is original sin that is remitted; the germ of native corruption, however, still remaining, though the fountain of grace and counteracting power be open. The *φρόνημα σαρκός* remains as a permitted remnant of the fall, and ground of trial, even in them that by baptism are regenerated—a point in which sad experience confirms Scripture and the ninth article. When baptism, as in many recorded cases of the Gospel, is administered to adults, it operates in remission of their former sins, both original and actual, provided they approach with penitent hearts and lively faith in Christ, through whom remission comes, together with purpose, through God's grace, to contend against the whole body of sin, and manfully to fight against the world, the flesh, and the devil. By this "one baptism" they obtain a privilege of receiving remission of their subsequent sins, on repentance, through faith in Christ. St. Peter says, *Repent, and be baptised, for the remission of sins, in the name of Jesus Christ*, Acts ii. 38—"a repentance," says Bishop Bull (*Harmon. Apostol.* p. 9), "which included in these Jews a reformation and abandonment of their Jewish prejudices, adopting Jesus as the Messiah, and, when embracing his religion by baptism, engaging to observe all his injunctions, both of belief and practice." Again, Ananias says to the newly-converted Paul, *Be baptised, and wash away thy sins* (Acts xxii. 16), the mode of remission appointed by Christ for those who *rightly* receive that sacrament. "For," says Doddridge, "God did not ordinarily give any particular person any public and visible token of pardon till he had submitted to baptism, which, being a visible token of favourable regard and a *seal of pardon*, may be said to wash away sins." Paul says of the church, *Christ doth sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of*

water, Ephes. v. 6. There must be all the requisites in the recipient of baptism: sorrow for sin, faith in Christ—in infants, by proxy; in adults, by personal vows—and an earnest purpose of reformation. Finally, remission of sins, obtained at first by the laver of regeneration, is after baptism given to frail beings on full repentance.

When proselytes were baptised, the requisite change of mind was called *παλιγγενεσία*. This was understood by the Jews; and hence our Lord asks Nicodemus, "*Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?*"

176. *The efficient cause or means of man's redemption, as distinguished from its final cause or end.*

The *efficient cause* is the love of God in giving his Son, and the obedience of Christ to his Father's will in giving himself a ransom for the sins of the world: the *means* is faith in that sacrifice: the *final cause or end* is the satisfaction of the divine justice, and the conferring of all the blessings which follow it—reconciliation with God, justification, adoption, sanctification, and eternal life.

EFFICIENT CAUSE.

For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life, John iii. 16. *Then said I, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God!* Ps. xl. 7, 8, John iv. 34. *One mediator, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all*, 1 Tim. ii. 6, Matt. xx. 28.

MEANS.

By grace ye are saved, through faith, Ephes. ii. 8.

FINAL CAUSE, OR END.

Justification. *Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. v. 1. *Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him*, Rom. v. 9.

Sanctification. *Christ made to us sanctification and redemption*, 1 Cor. i. 30.

Adoption. *That we might receive the adoption of sons*, Gal. iv. 5. *But ye have received the spirit of adoption*, Rom. viii. 15. *To whom belongeth the adoption and the glory*, Rom. ix. 4.

Eternal life. *But the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord*, Rom. vi. 23. *That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord*, Rom. v. 21.

177. "I believe in the communion of saints."

The "communion of saints" signifies the spiritual intercourse which saints (sanctified or holy persons) have with the triune God, with angels, departed saints, and one another. It is an intercourse with God and Christ; for *truly our fellowship is with the FATHER, and with his son JESUS CHRIST*, 1 John i. 3; *If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son and in the Father*, 1 John ii. 24. It is an intercourse with the Holy Ghost, as is plain from the blessing, *the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you, amen*, 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

But, more particularly, communion is that fellowship which the sanctified have with Christ and with all his benefits by faith, and among themselves by love; *that ye may have fellowship with us, as our fellowship is with the Son, &c.* 1 John i. 3. Christ prays for all believers, *that they might be one with the Father and the Son, even as the Father and the Son are one*, John xvii. 22, xiv. 20; *that they also may be one in us*, John xvii. 21.

This results from the Scriptural mode of describing Christ as the Head of the church and Saviour of the body, Ephes. v. 23; and his faithful disciples as the members, deriving from him spiritual health and nourishment, as branches in a tree live and flourish through the sap received from the trunk; *Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular*, 1 Cor. xii. 27; *For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that body being many, are one body, so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptised into that one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free*, 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13. And as the first sacrament unites us to that one body,

or makes us, in the words of our catechism, members of Christ, so the second communicates the spiritual nourishment and other benefits of that membership : *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ. For we being many are one bread ; for we are all partakers of that bread* (1 Cor. x. 16, 17), viz. *the bread of life, the true bread which came down from heaven*, John vi. 35, 33.

On this, too, is founded the doctrine of the resurrection ; for if Christ the head be risen, the members shall rise also. *I am the vine, ye are the branches ; as the branch cannot bear fruit in itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me*, John xv. 4, 5.

Now this union with a common head establishes the union of the members one with another ; for as the eye cannot say to the hand, "I have no need of thee," nor the head to the feet, "I have no need of you," so it is in the spiritual body as members of a common head, *in whom the whole body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that mutual communion which every joint supplieth, according to the essential working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love*, Ephes. iv. 16. In our sacramental office, according to these principles, we are said to become very members incorporate of the mystical body of Christ, "which is the blessed company of all faithful people."

This "communion of saints" extends to angels, who are *ministering spirits, sent forth to minister unto them who shall be heirs of salvation* (Heb. i. 14), and who *rejoice over the conversion of one sinner that repenteth*, Luke xv. 10. It extends to the spirits of departed saints ; for death is only the separation of the soul and the body, and as the soul does not die, the spiritual communion continues. Hence men and angels, under Christ, are called *the whole FAMILY in heaven and earth* ; and at the name of Jesus every knee is commanded to bow, *of things in heaven and things in the earth*.

The sacrament of the Lord's supper is, on this authority, a eucharist, or feast of thanksgiving and joy, where, "with angels and archangels, and all the company of heaven, we laud and

magnify the holy name of God, evermore praising him, and saying, Holy, holy, holy," &c.

We are come (says the apostle) *to an innumerable company of angels* (Heb. xii. 22), *who all worship the Son*, Heb. i. 6.

178. *Translate accurately, εἰς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον*, 1 John ii. 1. *In what different senses is the word παράκλητος used in the New Testament?*

"If any man sin, we have a RIGHTEOUS Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ."

Bishop Middleton says that the absence of the definite article before δίκαιον forbids the translation *the* righteous; but the translation he proposes,—*a* righteous person,—is highly objectionable.

Benson and some others give the translation here adopted. For what has the advocate to plead for our defects in righteousness?—his *own* righteousness, and his own sufferings. Hence I conceive that the efficacy of the advocate's pleading is assured to us by the quality attributed to him, δίκαιον.

The word παράκλητος, from παρακαλέω, is used as *an advocate*, as in this verse; and also as *an instructor* or *guide*, as in John xiv. 16, xvi. 7. In John xv. 16 it signifies *a witness*; and in xvi. 17 *a monitor*. The word *helper*, or *patron*, seems the best general term under which all the senses may be included; but it does not appear that the word signifies *a comforter*, unless to help, instruct, reprove, and intercede for, be understood as offices of comfort to those whose hearts sorrow had filled, because he who had stood towards them in all these relations was going away from the world, John xvi. 6. Here we may observe, that in our Lord's address there is a proof of a mysterious union in the Godhead, yet the person and offices being distinct, for he says, "I will send you another παράκλητος from the Father." This reconciles *me ye have not always*, with *lo, I am with you alway*, i. e. by the Spirit; and in heaven they are both intercessors, *for he* (Christ) *ever liveth to make intercession for us* (Heb. vii. 25); *and the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us*, Rom. viii. 26.

179. *Translate into Latin Matt. v. 13 and three following verses. Editors of the New Testament have used indiscriminately $\mu\omega\pi\alpha\nu\theta\eta$ and $\mu\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\theta\eta$: which reading is to be preferred?*

Vos terræ sal estis; sin autem saporem sal perdiderit, unde restituetur? ad nihilum valet ultra, nisi ad ejiciendum foras, et sub pedibus calcandum. Vos mundi lumina estis; urbs supra montem extructa abscondi nequit. Nec quis lampada accendens sub modio condit; sed in candelabrum statuit, ut per totum domum luceat. Lux autem vestra coram hominibus ita splendeat, ut bona opera aspiciant, et patrem cælestem magnificent.

In the *Æneid*, lib. ii. l. 133, Sinon tells the Trojans,

“mihi sacra parari,

Et SALSÆ fruges, et circum tempora vittæ.”

And Homer, *Iliad*, lib. i. 449, says,

$\chi\epsilon\rho\nu\acute{\iota}\psi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\ \delta\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$, καὶ οὐλοχότας ἀέλοντο.

Now this may throw light on Mark ix. 49, *For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.* Salt, then, in the passages before us, is used literally in regard to the sacrifices, and figuratively in regard to the grace of God, or spirit of wisdom, which the apostles were instructed to have in themselves (*ye are the salt of the earth*, Matt. v. 13); and the fire signifies the fiery trials of life. *If the salt have lost its savour, wherewith will ye season it?* signifies — if ye, as the means of establishing the covenant of friendship and protection, be destitute of the spirit of grace and wisdom, what shall supply its place? Then as to St. Luke's *It is neither fit for the land nor for the dunghill, but men cast it out*, we would say, If your doctrine of a covenant between God and man be destitute of the savour of grace, wisdom, and love, which may exemplify and enforce your doctrine, it will be unheeded by men, and nothing can supply the place of that savour.

Have, therefore, says St. Mark, ix. 50, *salt (wisdom) in yourselves, and be at peace one with another*; and thus the covenant will make its way.

This explanation is quite consistent with the use of salt in the sacrifices as an antiseptic; and metaphorically when applied to the apostles, as preservatives of the earth from corruption in doctrine or practice; for it may have been made the symbol of a covenant by reason of its uses and effects in preserving from corruption.

Μαρῶν is simply *to consume or waste away*; *μωρῶνομαι* is *to become insipid*; and Maundrel, Shaw, and other travellers, state that when rock-salt is exposed to the rain, sun, and air, the outer surface becomes tasteless, while the innermost, connected with the rock, retains its savour. The parallel passage in St. Mark (ix. 5) says, accordingly, *ἐὰν τὸ ἅλας ἀναλον γένηται, become saltless, with what shall ye prepare or season it, ἀρτύσετε*, the word used by St. Luke, who likewise uses *μωρανθῆ*; and Campbell paraphrases the words of St. Matthew (v. 13), *wherewith shall it be salted*, by the phrase "wherewith shall its saltiness be restored" (*μωρανθῆ*); and this is the more significant word.

The etymology of *μωρός* is—a transference of the absence of discernment from the taste to the mind. The allusion of the preceding passage in the three evangelists is to the temple-service, wherein the victims were prepared for sacrifice by a seasoning of salt, agreeably to Leviticus ii. 13, *every meat-offering, and all thy offerings, shalt thou season with salt*; called *the covenant of salt* there, and in Num. xviii. 19 and 2 Chron. xiii. 5. Salt in the East is a symbol of a covenant of friendship and protection. If you once taste of the salt in an Arab's tent, you may rely upon him; and to salt, as a religious rite, there is allusion both in Virgil and Homer, as we have seen above.

180. *Phylacteries.*

Phylacteries were small scrolls of parchment, on which were written certain sentences of the law, enclosed in leather cases, and bound with strings on the forehead and left arm by Pharisees, or on the wrist by Sadducees. They derive their Greek name *φυλακτήρια* from *φυλάσσω*, *custodio*, either from their keeping the law in remembrance, or because, in our Saviour's time,

they were deemed to be amulets, preserving the wearer from evil. They were called by the Jews תְּפִלִּין *tephillin*, from תָּפַל, *prayer*, because usually worn at the time of prayer. The use of these appendages arose from a misinterpretation of Deut. vi. 8, *And thou shalt bind them* (these words of the law) *for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes*. This direction plainly refers to the whole law, and not to slips and sentences; and must be explained by the words of the second verse preceding, *And these words shall be in thine heart*, Deut. vi. 6; or by Prov. iii. 3, *Write them upon the table of thy heart*, and Prov. vi. 21.*

The schedules contained the decalogue, but oftener four sentences: the first, *Sanctify unto me all the first-born*, &c. Exod. xiii. 2, to the end of verse 10; the second, *And it shall be*, &c. Exod. xiii. 11, to the end of verse 16; the third, *Hear, O Israel*, &c. Deut. vi. 4, to the end of verse 9; the fourth, *And it shall come to pass*, &c. Deut. xi. 13, to the end of verse 21.

Tephillin is the rabbinical name of phylacteries. Moses calls them תְּפִלִּין, from תָּפַל, *to fasten*; and hence the Septuagint-name is ἀσάλευτα, *immovable ornaments*.

All Jews wore them; and Christ only reproves the ostentation and conception of superior sanctity in making them *broad*, instead of attending to the spiritual application: he condemns an extreme care about trifles and externals, and conceiving that there was merit therein. The Pharisees made the scrolls and cases longer than usual, and the thongs or ribands were knotted in the form of a letter.

The practice is supposed to be alluded to in Rev. xiii. 16, where the subjects of antichrist have a mark on their right hands and on their foreheads; Godwin's *Moses and Aaron*, lib. i. p. 51; Jennings, b. i. c. 10.

* Some were inserted into the door-posts, in literal compliance with Deut. vi. 9; of which there is an example in the Duke of Sussex's library at Kensington.

181. *The Talmud, Mishna, and Gemara.*

Talmud is a word signifying *doctrine*; and the Talmud is a collection of the traditional precepts of the Jews, composed of the Mishna and Gemara. About the time of Simon the Just, B.C. 300, an attention to the Jewish traditions began to prevail. It was pretended, that, besides the written law, God communicated to Moses on the mount many maxims and explanations of Scripture orally, and that these were transmitted traditionally through Aaron, Joshua, and others, to the Great Sanhedrim. From these they were afterwards said to have descended to Simeon and Gamaliel, and at length came, A.D. 140, to the rabbi Jehuda, or Juda Hakkadosh, preceptor to the Emperor Antoninus, and ornament of the school of Tiberias. The collection occupied him forty years; and was published under the name of the *Mishna* (from מִשְׁנָה, *iteravit*), a word signifying *repetition*, and called by the Greeks *δεντέρισις*. It consists of six books, having further subdivisions; the best edition being that of Surenhusius, in six volumes, Amsterdam, 1698. It contains instructions and decisions upon all subjects—civil, political, and religious.

The *Mishna* being much studied by the Jews, their learned men, conceiving it to be both confused and incomplete, employed themselves in writing commentaries on the text, and these glosses were published under the name of *Gemara*, or *completion*. The first Gemara was that of Jerusalem, by most referred to the third century; the other, and more ample one, was that of Babylon, compiled in the sixth century. Thus there are two Gemaras; and when either is published with the one Mishna, the whole is called the *Talmud*.

The מִשְׁנָה, *cabbala*, is the more childish part of the Talmud, consisting of pretended mysteries—as making words and meanings out of numeral letters; “pulverising names, and making the Bible a series of acrostics, anagrams, and charms.”—Allen's *Modern Judaism*.

The Jewish sect of Karaites, from קַרְיָיִת, *Scripture*,* rejects the Talmud altogether, acknowledging only the Old Testament.

* Hence the Mahomedan scripture, or Koran.

182. *In vindication of the miracles recorded by Moses, reply to a deist.*

The method so ably adopted by Leslie (*Method with a Deist*) is as follows :—A man tells the existing generation, and holds his sway over them by telling them, that he had conducted them from London to Southwark across the dried channel of the Thames, and that they were marvellously preserved during forty years, fed with food from heaven and water from a rock, without their shoes wearing out : he (at the same time, while the people are yet living) institutes a yearly festival for the perpetual remembrance of a fact connected with these wonders. Would they believe him ? would they submit to his leading and instruction, if such facts had not actually occurred ? would not some Korah or Abihu dispute (not his authority, his stretch of power, but) the facts themselves, as a ground of rebellion, or nutriment for their jealousy ?

But the deists attribute the facts to natural causes. The transit of the Red Sea was at a neap-tide ; the quails were birds of passage ; the manna was the fruit or exudation of a tree or shrub,—the common manna of the shops ; and the water of the rock was a natural spring.* But, first, the transit is agreed on by travellers to have been opposite to Ras Mousa, the Cape of Moses, on the Arabian side, as Cape Adaggi, on the west, denotes *deliverance*, four leagues south of Suez, and a league in breadth, with fourteen feet in depth of water (a league to drown the *whole host* of Pharaoh!) : secondly, the difficulty is, to conceive this food and drink in quantities sufficient to support 600,000 men, besides

* Water was twice supplied miraculously : at Horeb, where there are still traces of a stream on the rock, on which they fell back for many years, having command of the interjacent country—whence it is called *the rock that followed them*, 1 Cor. x. 4, till they came to the hostile country of Edom and the empty ravine or bed of the Jordan ; and then the miracle was repeated at Kadesh, near Mount Hor, the thirty-third station (different from Kadesh Barnea, the thirteenth), to prevent an interception of the first supply by the Edomites, round whose territory the Israelites marched, being denied a peaceful passage through it. See Num. ch. xx.

women and children: and, thirdly, these flights of birds, and neap-tides, happened, most conveniently, at the very juncture when they were wanted. As to the manna, was a miracle wanted to deprive it of its cathartic power? And why not make a food somewhat resembling it, as a trial of faith? The real derivation of manna is מַן מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, i. e. the Chaldean מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, *quid?* “quærebant enim Judæi, Quid hoc? מַן הַשָּׁמַיִם, *mān-hu*: ignorabant enim quid esset.” BYTHNERI *Clavis*, p. 51. Verily this Moses must have been what Tyndal’s Bible calls Joseph, “a lucky fellow!” He has (for the nonce) a stock in hand of east winds and low tides, of eclipses of the sun and volcanic eruptions, to make a darkness or usher in a law at any time: *per far il miracolo*, as the priests say at Naples of the blood of St. Januarius.

Bruce the traveller received a set of queries from a French *savant*, respecting the depth of the Red Sea near Kolzum (the modern Arabic word, meaning *destruction*); the name מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, *the sea of weeds*, arguing a shallow, and the consequent probability of a ford at low water. He rejected them with the utmost disdain, affirming that he was not upon a tour of infidelity. See Sicard’s treatise on the *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses*; Schimmelpenninck, p. 171; the notes to the *Pictorial Bible* in loc.; *Fragments to Calmet*; Bruce, Burckhardt, Niebuhr, &c.; and Mansford’s *Gazetteer of Scripture*.

183. *Did the Jews ever baptise, and in what cases?*

The Jews baptised proselytes or converts to their faith, as part of the ceremony of admission to their Church. Baptism was held to signify purification from the pollutions of heathenism, the putting off of the old and putting on of the new man. Doddridge refers to the water of separation (Num. xix.), made of the ashes of a red heifer, as a purification from sin (from the transgression of the legal ordinances, such as having touched a corpse or disturbed a grave), wherewith the unclean person was to sprinkle and bathe himself, as an early indication and emblem of baptism. And St. Paul makes the passing through the Red Sea a type of Christian baptism; for *all our fathers were baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea*, 1 Cor.

x. 1, 2. Noah's survival of the flood, and setting foot on the baptised earth, and the brazen laver in the tabernacle, signified purification from the stains of evil by water: and we must observe, that it is not the washing of cups and platters and tables that our Lord condemns in the Pharisees, but the neglect of the inward purity of which that rite was the emblem.

The rabbins insisted that the proselytes of righteousness, after circumcision, should undergo baptism by immersion. This was considered as being born again, *παλιγγενεσία*, *regeneration*, or, in the Jewish phrase, receiving a new soul; a phrase which throws light on the discourse between our Saviour and Nicodemus, *Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?*

184. *Worship of the Jews contrasted with that of the Samaritans.*

Jerusalem was the place which God chose out of all the tribes to put his name there; thither should they come and seek to his habitation, and thither bring their burnt-offerings and sacrifices, &c. Deut. xii. 5, 6, 7, 1 Kings xiv. 21, 2 Chron. xii. 13. There, too, was the lamp, light, Schechinah, or symbol of the divine presence, 1 Kings xi. 36. Thither, three times a-year, at the festivals of the passover, pentecost, and tabernacles, were the males of all the tribes to repair, Deut. xvi. 16; *whither the tribes go up unto the testimony of Israel* (Ps. cxxii. 4, Exod. xvi. 24), i. e. the ark of the covenant—religiously, a centre of unity in worship; politically, a bond of unanimity, a reconciliation of differences, a basis of strength, an Amphictyonic council.

The Samaritans, then, were schismatics, though in some measure involuntarily; for being repulsed in their application to unite themselves with the Jews in rebuilding the Temple after the captivity, they built a temple on Mount Gerizim, which was *not* the place where God chose to be publicly worshipped. To accommodate their schism to the words of Scripture commanding an altar to be raised and sacrifices to be offered on Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 4, 5, Josh. viii. 30-31), they changed the name of Ebal to *Gerizim* in the Samaritan Pentateuch.

This difference respecting the place is alluded to by the woman of Samaria in her conference with Christ, *Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem God ought to be worshipped*, John iv. 20; meaning by "our fathers," Abraham and Jacob, who worshipped on an altar near Sichem, Gen. xii. 7, xiii. 4. Our Saviour replies, *Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews*, John iv. 20.

This is not a charge of idolatry, for the Samaritans had abandoned that long before the time of Christ; but of other worship than that appointed by God, as the preparation for the appearance of his Son. And as the Samaritans only received the law of Moses, they could not be so perfectly instructed in the initiatory nature and plan of the Old Testament as the Jews, who saw the progression and minute pointings out of prophecy. The reading of the sacred books in the synagogues of Samaria, and by consequence the explanations given of them, by excluding the Psalms, prophets, and hagiographa, inculcated a less correct expectation and description of the Messiah than was imparted to the Jews. The Samaritan woman knew that Messiah was coming; but could not tell the time of his coming, nor understand his life of persecution, through her want of trust in Daniel and Isaiah. Yet this want of confidence in their irregular legal rites must have given them a leaning towards the moral virtues; for although as a body they were a match for the Jews in hatred, or, according to the proverb, *there was no love lost between them*, yet the individual Samaritans brought forward are distinguished by our Lord as grateful or charitable.

The Samaritans refused our Lord hospitality as he passed from Jerusalem to Galilee; and the apostles besought him to consume them with fire from heaven. Yet that meek Saviour told them they knew not what spirit they were of; and shewed them a Samaritan who was neighbour to the wounded Jew, when two men of Judah, even two ministers of religion, a Levite and a priest, passed by on the other side.

185. *The state of religion among the Greeks and Romans had a natural tendency to cause infidelity to the Christian religion amongst the men of rank and learning in the Gentile world: what were the peculiarities of Christianity which would tend to aggravate it?*

Worldly-minded men, considering religion as a state-engine, are averse from having the creed of the state, however corrupt, at any time, or under any circumstances, disturbed, and see civil revolution in any attempt at religious change. There is a spurious liberality of indolence and indifference, whose language is, It matters not what religion a man professes, provided he is only sincere: and although there was no objection of old to add a new deity to the Pantheon when another nation was embraced within the empire, yet a religion which admitted of no compromise, which waged war with all others, was regarded with jealousy and abhorrence. Independently of a magistracy desirous of suppressing all commotion (especially when conscious of their own responsibility to the Roman emperor); and of a priesthood, some of them connected with noble families, who lived by the prevailing superstition; and of the Demetrii, and men of other trades, who trembled for the threatened destruction of their craft,—even the indolent men of taste and pleasure would deprecate the overthrow of their magnificent temples and unrivalled statuary, the boasts and perfection of architecture and sculpture. No wonder then, when the apostles first set their foot on European ground, that almost all ranks should exclaim, *These who have turned the world upside down, have come hither also.*

But the low origin of the new religion, the meanness and poverty of its first publishers, its unpromising means of assailing the strongholds of established paganism, must have prepared for it a reception of ridicule and contempt among Gentiles of rank and learning. Can any good thing come out of Nazareth? said even a Jew. Can any good thing come out of *Judea*? would be the more natural sneer of a proud and scornful heathen. *Credat Judæus Apella; non ego: and arcano quicquid tradidit*

volumine Moses. In particular, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was calculated to repel the philosophers of Greece and Asia, even those who admitted a certain immortality of the soul, by metempsychosis, or pantheistical absorption.

The enlightened men of Greece and Rome knew little of Christianity, which some of them considered as a new form of idolatry, or *setting forth of strange gods*, and others as *atheism*, there being no visible object of worship. The first Roman historians called it a pestilent superstition, and held it to be a variety of Judaism; while of Judaism itself they were lamentably ignorant, some holding it to be the worship of an ass; Tacitus, *Annal.* The philosophers were too proud to listen to unlearned men, not regularly bred in their schools, and adhering to none of their theories, or to receive a doctrine which brought to nought the wisdom of the wise. A man of humble parentage and obscure life, put to death as a malefactor, and rising again—this man the Saviour of the world, and a Divine person, was to the Greeks foolishness. Though fond of something new, they had no relish for such novelties, and said of their teachers, *What will these babblers say?* Nor need we wonder that, when they came to speak of the resurrection of the dead, their reception was mockery.

The spirituality of the Gospel was another main obstacle to its being embraced by men of rank and learning among the Gentiles. These had been accustomed to a religion which was all composed of outward pomp and ceremonies, accompanied with a few shewy civil virtues,—“*Discite justitiam moniti, et non temnere divos,*” *Æn.* vi. 619,—virtues of which the chief was bravery, so much so as to stand in nomenclature for them all; as in modern Italy, virtue is *vertù*, a taste for the *belle arti*. And the examples of their gods gave the reins to their licentious passions. They, the warlike worshippers of Mars, the jovial votaries of Bacchus, the sensual imitators of Jupiter (of course deeming the deeds of these gods to be peccadilloes) were not likely to exchange this religion of rites, debaucheries, profligacies, and sanctioned quarrels, for a simple worship, which disturbed them in their habitual indulgences; a worship which

laid the axe to the root of the tree, which probed to the core of principle, insisted on purity even of the thoughts, and searched and demanded the heart.

The nature of the moral duties inculcated by the Gospel must have greatly aggravated the dislike to it among the higher order of Gentiles. Forgiveness of injuries was deemed among them the mark of a tame spirit; humility was as adverse to their lofty learning, and Christian resignation was as different from their stoical fortitude, as peaceful submission is from proud resistance; while condescension towards the poor was but little understood by the lordly masters of slaves. False magnanimity, pride, nationality, love of conquest, love of distinction, and in Greece (when conquered) love of disputation, were the favourite virtues of the heathen world; and these had little affinity with the true magnanimity, the patience, gentleness, simplicity, and universal benevolence, so prominent in the teaching and example of the meek and lowly Jesus.

But, above all, the Gospel was likely to meet with repulsion among the high-born and wealthy Gentiles, as a system of self-denial. Scepticism, not assured of futurity, will never boldly plunge into the ocean, and seek the opposite shore. It will dip its foot and draw back, and never cut off its retreat upon this world, so long as it holds the next doubtful. It will try to reconcile the interests of both worlds more than the nature of the case admits. It will never go out of its depth and firm footing, or lose hold of a branch on its own side of the stream, till death come to thrust it violently into the deep. Though godliness has a promise of the life that now is, that promise extends to its honest advantages and calm satisfactions, but by no means to its unrestrained indulgences and vain-glorious achievements. To the heathens, then, in such circumstances, how strange must have been the doctrine, *Be not ye conformed to the present world, but be transformed by the renewing of your minds. If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me*, Matt. xvi. 24, x. 28, Luke ix. 23, 24. And when, in the progress of the Gospel, persecution followed persecution, when the promises of the Saviour and his apostles were fulfilled, that through much tribulation his disciples should

enter into the kingdom of heaven, Acts xiv. 22; that they were appointed unto afflictions, 1 Thess. iii. 3; that woe unto them when all men spoke well of them; and blessed were they when men reviled and persecuted them for his sake; that all who would live godly in Jesus Christ must suffer persecution, 2 Tim. iii. 12; that if in this life only they had hope in Christ, they were of all men most miserable, 1 Cor. xv. 19; that they should be put out of the synagogues and killed, John xvi. 2;—when mockings, scourgings, stonings, sawings asunder; when contempt, scorn, ignominy, poverty, loss of all things, loss of life, the most cruel and racking martyrdoms, were seen to be the *certain*, and in this world the *only*, recompense of conversion,—can we wonder that the higher orders of the Gentile world, wantoning in the lap of softness, reposing on Sybarite rose-beds, abounding in the possessions and revelling in the luxuries of variety, should resist the encroachments of so unpromising a system? The only wonder is, that they furnished any converts at all, which they never would have done but for the working of miracles by the first preachers, and the clear attestation of the facts of the Gospel by the blood of the martyrs, which thus became the seed of the church.

186. Doctrines or precepts of the Gospel in parables only.

That although men are saved by the atonement of Christ, not by their own merits, yet the blessedness of heaven shall be proportioned according to the use which every man shall have made of his opportunities, seems to be set forth only by the parable of the talents. Yet the parable of the labourers called into the vineyard shews, that a pious heathen first made acquainted with Christianity late in life, or a child whose career of principle is cut short in its earliest years, will be equally happy in futurity with the servant of fourscore who has diligently borne the burden and heat of the day. The intermediate state, with its happiness and pains, can be only made out from the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. That unprofitableness is equally liable to eternal punishment with actual sinfulness, is proved by the doom of the servant who wrapped his

talent in a napkin, and by the fruitless fig-tree. Where do we learn that self-condemning penitence is a pearl of greater price in the sight of God than proud self-acquittal, so well as in the story of the Pharisee and publican? Where do we learn so clearly that justification is an act of grace, and not a reward for good deeds done, as in the gift of the wedding-garment provided by the King, and in the free remission of the 10,000 talents from the nobleman to his servant? and where do we find so convincingly, that even when provided, it may be forfeited by negligence or misdeeds, as in the refusal to *wear* the garment as a covering for the poverty of the guest, or the hard-heartedness of the forgiven servant towards his fellow-servant—coupled with the intelligence that both were cast out? The Canaanitish woman, and the woman who importuned the judge into the granting of her suit, intimate that perseverance in prayer will often obtain, in the end, what good things or graces may be at first withheld. From the parable of the wheat and tares suffered to flourish together unto the harvest, we learn, that we are not to look in this life to the equitable recompenses of vice and holiness, but to the end of the world.

The wide diffusion and universal dominion of the Gospel, from the small beginning of twelve persons celebrating a paschal supper in Jerusalem, is finely described under the similitude of the grain of mustard-seed; and the sparrow, that falls not without the permission of the Father of heaven (though an allusion or similitude only), may be regarded as a lesson by parable on the doctrine of particular providence.

187. Πάσχα, when instituted.

The *πάσχα*, or passover, in Hebrew פֶּסַח, was a feast of the Jews, instituted in commemoration of the deliverance of their families from the last plague, and the general doom of their oppressors, by the destroying angel's passing by the houses of the Israelites on the night when he slew the first-born of Egypt. This passover took place whenever the blood of a lamb, which they were instructed to kill, was seen sprinkled on the lintels or architraves and door-posts of any house, Exod. ch. xii. The feast fell on the 14th day of the Egyptian month *Abib*, or green

ears of corn, thenceforward called *Nisan*, from נִסָּן, *to be removed*, or נִסָּן, *a banner*, and in future counted as the first month of the year, instead of *Tisri*, or September, which had traditionally been held as the month of the creation. As the Israelites went forth in haste, with their dough unbaked, seven days of unleavened bread were appointed to follow the passover, beginning on the 15th, and sometimes including the 14th, whence both days were called the passover. But the paschal lamb was killed on the 14th day of the month *Nisan*—in the Hebrew, between the two evenings; that is to say, the first evening beginning at noon and going on to sunset, and the second from sunset to dark; and as our Saviour—*Christ our passover*, 1 Cor. v. 7; *the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world*, John i. 29—gave up the ghost, literally, *dismissed his spirit*, ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, on the very day of the Jewish passover, soon after the ninth hour, or three in the afternoon, the hour of the *evening sacrifice*, this direction is undoubtedly typical; as were likewise the ordinances that the paschal lamb should be a male and without blemish, and that no bone of it should be broken, John xix. 36.

In the Jewish celebration of the passover, the family sat down as soon as it was dark to the paschal supper. The master of the family began by washing his hands, taking up the cup, and pronouncing the usual benedictions, and was followed by the whole household. The lamb was then laid on the table, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, as a memorial of the haste of their flight and the bitterness of their bondage; and this was followed by a second washing and by the second cup. The master then distributed the unleavened cakes among his guests, Matt. xxvi. 26; and all having partaken of the lamb, the blessing was repeated, and the third cup, called *the cup of blessing* (1 Cor. x. 16, Matt. xxvi. 27), was circulated. This description throws light on the institution of the blessed sacrament of the Lord's supper by our Saviour himself, the night before he suffered. The bread was distributed by the Master, and preceded the circulation of the cup. The Levitical ordinance enjoining the eating of the passover with shoes on their feet and staff in hand—a type of the *wilderness-state*—was laid

aside when the people had reached the land of promise, a type of the *heavenly* state.

The Lord's supper, then, was the passover of the new testament, the ordinances being all spiritualised in their meaning. *Christ our passover is sacrificed for us ; therefore let us keep the feast not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, 1 Cor. v. 6, 7.*

The Jews began their months with the first appearance of the new moon, which was proclaimed at Jerusalem by Levites stationed on an eminence, and usually on the Mount of Olives, to catch the earliest segment or rim of light ; Brown's *Antiq.* That was the first day, and (in Nisan) the fourteenth day would be the day of killing the paschal lamb ; and the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, sometimes called the passover, would fall at full moon of the 15th, which in the case before us was Friday. The Lord's supper, then, was rightly eaten on the 14th, or Thursday evening, the preceding day to the real feast of unleavened bread. Some commentators seem to err in saying that this was not the paschal supper, but an ordinary meal. But our Saviour says on the 14th (Thursday), "I will keep the *passover* with my disciples;" and when *even* was come, sat down with the twelve. The mistake of thinking the day to be the day preceding the paschal supper, arises from confounding the paschal supper with the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, or the 15th. But if our Lord did *anticipate* the real day, this might happen from the impossibility of keeping the feast on the following evening, when his life and suffering would be over, and his spirit would be in paradise. The Israelites ate their first passover *before* the destruction of the first-born. On the day following (the Friday), the chief-priests would not enter into the hall of judgment in Pilate's house, *lest they should be defiled, that they might eat the passover* (John xviii. 28)—that is, the feast of unleavened bread, called the passover. That, then, was the regular feast, the feast of unleavened bread, the commemoration of the Exodus, Lev. xxiii. 5, 6 ; but it seems that there was a latitude allowed as to the day, and even to the month, provided only the memorial was kept up ; for those who

could not keep the feast, by reason of distance or legal uncleanness, on the express day of the first month, were enjoined to keep it at even of the 14th day (not the 15th) of the second month.

It is also thought that there might be differences of opinion as to the real first day of any month, since by reason of a cloud the first faint edge of the new moon might not be seen in one evening, or might be seen in one point of view and not in another, or observed first at an equivocal time of the evening, and thus render it doubtful which of two days should be called the first day, and regulate all the others in that month.

Besides, if some made no account of a few minutes as a day, and others, according to the ancient computation, counted a small remnant for an entire day, the 14th and 15th might be used indiscriminately for a feast, according to different calculations.

I conclude that our Lord kept the real paschal feast, and suffered on the first day of unleavened bread, being the feast of the following day, and that that was the feast which the chief-priests misnamed the passover, just as we say — the Christmas holydays, a Christmas-box, a Christmas-dinner, any time until twelfth-night.

The only difficulty here is in our Lord's suffering on the day subsequent to the anniversary of the slaying of the passover; but if he *could not* institute the Christian passover and suffer on the same day, and fulfil all the other parts of the type, — if he suffered within twenty-four hours, there seems nothing in any of the Gospels to contradict the fact that the 14th was actually held as the real passover-day at Jerusalem, and to render it necessary that he should *die* on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread (though unleavened bread was eaten with the paschal lamb). As the Christian Sabbath was first instituted a day beyond the Jewish (necessity admitting the rest of one day according to the commandment), to commemorate Christ's having fully accomplished the work of redemption, so is our celebration of the paschal feast advanced a day beyond that kept by our Lord and his apostles, in order to commemorate the important fact of his death — the supper and institution of the sacrament being in *his* case *necessarily* a day earlier.

188. *Christianity necessary to temporal happiness.*

The Christian code, wherever it prevails as the principle of action, produces all those virtues whose effects are temporal happiness, and, even in unavoidable calamities, that trust in God and submission to his will which tranquillise the mind, and cheer dejection by the vision of hope. Thus godliness hath, in many respects, the promise of the life that is, as well as of that which is to come. The Christian is happy for the present life, at peace with God, with man, and within his own breast. *Who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good? Love your enemies*, is a secret of temporal happiness. A mind harbouring hatred or resentment is its own scourge, and cannot be happy.

But many of the evils inimical to temporal happiness, and prevalent in the heathen world, are obviated by the code and even by the spirit of Christianity. The Gospel has accomplished much public good, and on a large scale. Polygamy, exposure of children, gladiatorial combats, fights of wild beasts with men, divorce in the spirit of caprice, and domestic severity, have been thereby abolished. War, slavery, cruelty to animals, torture in punishment, have been mitigated by the prevalence of Christian sentiments; and the immolation of widows in the East has greatly ceased. The poor are especial objects of regard in the code of Christianity, and their instruction and comfort are connected in Christian states: they are elevated in the scale of society as rational and immortal beings, and their temporal and spiritual good are both consulted. Hospitals for the sick were unknown in the heathen world; and their first introduction is recorded to have been owing to the charity of a Christian matron, St. Ephrem, at Edessa; which provoked the apostate Julian to similar exertions, that the Christians might be deprived of the honour. See Jebb, *Practical Theology*, vol. i. p. 198; and Jortin, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iii. p. 71. Following this exemplification of the spirit of the Gospel, Deogratias, in the West, converted two churches into hospitals after the sacking of Rome.

How has Christianity breathed its spirit into the institutions,

codes, ordinances, manners, and courtesies of nations ! But it is chiefly in the sequestered vale of private life that the Gospel hides its unostentatious graces, whose praise is not of men, but of God. It is there we see its effects, in meekness, and chastity, and self-denial, and forgiveness, and good offices, and unwearied going-out of one's self for the support and consolation of others, among parents, children, friends, and even enemies. Let a man meet with an accident in the most profligate alley of the metropolis, and you shall see Christianity in the kindness and gratuitous services of those whom you might otherwise call heathens, and who were never in a place of worship in their lives.

The Gospel so admirably reinforces laws, guards character, and strengthens all moral obligations, that it has been silently sanctioned by libertines ; and this adoption has even given infidels occasion to say, that the practical uses of it, and not its intrinsic truth, have been the causes of its receiving political support.

Government, too, has been greatly improved by Christianity, which, on the one hand, calls on subjects to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake ; and, on the other, breathes that spirit of liberty by which despotism vanishes before the law of opinion ; for, civilly and spiritually, where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. The natural and final equality of man, the real insignificance of all save moral distinctions, and the present necessity of civil and social distinctions and subordinations, with the wisdom and duty of acknowledging and maintaining them, are principles inculcated by the Gospel.

189. *Grotius's proof of the existence of a God.*

"It is evident that some things had a beginning, that is, began to be : now, they could not be the cause of their own existence, for that would be to act ; and that which has no being cannot act, for that would be to be before it was, which is impossible. Something, then, must have existed before these things, and caused their existence. Pursue the same reasoning with respect to this originating cause, and so on, ascending from cause to cause, and you must at length arrive at some *first* cause, which never had a beginning, but is self-existent. For of those

things which had a beginning, there is either a first cause or there is none. Now, if it be denied that there is any cause, then things which had a beginning were without a cause, or existed or came out of nothing of themselves, which is absurd. This great non-created first cause of all effects is God, who never had a beginning; in other words, who existed from all eternity."

Grotius likewise argues from the universal consent of nations, which must either have originated in a communication from God himself, or come down by tradition from the first parents of the human race. A man saying, here and there, that there is no God, or writing his name with *αθ.* in a traveller's album, or avowing atheism in a court of justice, makes nothing against universal consent; for he may love singularity; or be confident in a daring impunity, because sentence is not executed speedily; or it may be his interest that there should be no God; or he may be, as Solomon says he is, a fool: for he cannot *prove* his denial of a God, and may open his eyes to the fact, in regard to which millions oppose him, too late for the retraction of his blasphemies. To ascribe things to a fortuitous concurrence of atoms, or to an infinite succession of causes, is to encounter still greater difficulties.

190. *The Messiah is already come.*

He was to come before the sceptre should finally depart from the tribe of Judah, Gen. xlix. 10; and while the second temple was yet standing, Mal. iii. 1; and to be cut off, but not for himself, at the end of seventy weeks of years from the going forth of the commandment to rebuild Jerusalem after the Babylonish captivity, Dan. ix. 24-27.

The sceptre, or rod of tribual authority, or the tribual distinction, or the power of enforcing ecclesiastical jurisdiction, has long departed from Judah, and that tribe is confounded with the mass of dispersed Jews. Moreover, Malachi has said, *The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his TEMPLE* (iii. 1); but the Temple of Jerusalem was razed to the ground by Titus, and the seventy weeks of years—or, in the prophetic computation of a day for a year, or a week for seven years, 490 years—expired with Jesus Christ, verifying him alone to be the Shiloh,

the Lord who came to his temple, the true and only Messiah, unto whom the gathering of the *peoples* (the Gentiles over all the earth) should be—who should seal up the vision and prophecy, make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness.

191. *Paley states one fact relating to Christ's resurrection as indisputable: on what authority? Could the apostles be enthusiasts?*

The fact stated by Paley as indisputable, is, not that Christ rose from the dead, but that the apostles and first propagators of Christianity invariably and concurrently asserted that he rose. And he makes this statement on the joint authority of the Gospels and Epistles, and all contemporary writings, and of all writings of every succeeding age, genuine and spurious, against Christianity or in favour of it, no one questioning the constant agreement of the apostles in their assertion of this *fact*. This places their concurrent accounts of the resurrection of their Master on a very different footing from any other part of their narrative, since *belief* in such accounts would in great measure depend on the genuineness and authenticity of their writings. Now, respecting their *account* of the resurrection, no such discussion is admissible. Whatever we may think of the fact, their *account* of the fact is before us: their conduct and sufferings shew it to be genuine. The question is, Is it authentic?—and this resolves itself into two other inquiries. Did the apostles willingly assert a falsehood, or were they themselves deceived? The utter improbability of their enduring so much as their account involved them in, from which no one flinched, or even receded into a safe and prudent silence, without assignable or conceivable *motive* for falsehood, sets aside the former notion: and there only remains the possibility of their being themselves deceived, that is, of their being *enthusiasts*, or weak men, easily imposed on. The reappearance of Christ after death, however, could not be an illusion of their senses, for he shewed himself, not in the dark, but in the open day—not to one, but to many—not on one occasion, but on many—not on one day, but forty—not to persons prepared or predisposed for conviction (as en-

thusiasts or weak men usually are); but to a disheartened and then dispersing band, who had lost their hopes, and were returning to their homes and occupations; some of them even unreasonably sceptical, and who would not believe the resurrection of their Master till they had not only seen him, but heard his voice, and until they had thrust their hands into the spear and nail marks; so that one of them writes, in answer to the heresy of the *ΔοκERAL*, *That which we have seen and heard, and that which our hands have handled of the Word of life, that declare we unto you*, 1 John i. 1, 3. Was this the behaviour of enthusiasts, or of weak men easily imposed upon? Again, contrast the actual conduct of these disciples before and after their Master's death. *Before* it, they all forsook him and fled; *after* it, they assumed a new boldness and constancy, and, with one accord (for it does not appear that the son of perdition, the traitor and suicide, knew of his Master's rising again), they went forth into all lands, enduring privations, encountering unheard of sufferings, while preaching the doctrine of the resurrection.

Since, then, the apostles could not be deceived, and, from the probity and simplicity of their character, not less than the internal evidence of their narrative, would not and could not deliberately impose a falsehood on the world, well may we ask—

Why

Should all conspire to cheat as with a lie?

Unask'd their pains, ungrateful their advice,

Starving their gains, and martyrdom their price.—DRYDEN.

The Jews attempted to stop the circulation of the narrative by saying that, while the guards were asleep, the disciples had stolen the body. Now, if this had been true, if the disciples had indeed stolen the corpse, the possession of it would have extinguished their hopes, silenced their assertions of its being risen, and stayed their steps in encountering persecution and death for a story of which the falsehood was before their eyes. But a guard of thirty Roman soldiers could not be all asleep on their watch, seeing that such an offence was death by the Roman law; or, if they *were* all asleep, their testimony was worthless, as that of men who could only conjecture what happened under such circumstances.

St. Matthew relates that the Jews were well aware of the expectation of Christ's disciples, that he would rise again; and in this case the precaution of artful and immoral men would have been, not only to have removed the body, but to place it in custody, to be brought forth at any time, as a short and conclusive disproof of the story circulated by the apostles, and neither falsehood nor enthusiasm could have withstood it. But this they never did—the body was never produced.

192. Propagation of Christianity, whether among Jews or heathens, was difficult, from the very nature of the case.

The Jews were a people chosen by God, from all the nations of the earth, as depositories of a religion revealed from heaven, teaching the worship of one God, supported by his direct agency, and comprehending a code of moral laws which raised them above the surrounding idolaters. They were distinguished even by their features; and by a ritual communication from heaven. And they understood their prophets as announcing a conqueror, who should raise them to the temporal dominion over the world.

Is it possible, then, that they could have welcomed or kindly received a religion which destroyed their hopes and humbled their pride?—which, instead of a mighty deliverer and victorious army, brought them a lowly wanderer, with an obscure band of followers?—which, instead of a conquest over the world, spoke of subjection to the Roman emperor?—which foretold the near abolition of their pompous rites, and the destruction of their city and temple?—which put a humbling and spiritual, and, to their prejudices, unintelligible, construction on the magnificent delineations of their prophets?—and, above all, struck at their national privileges and pride, by admitting all the Gentiles to share in their birthright and to obtain equal access to the divine favour with themselves, to rush within the *chel*, and even pass through the rent vail of the temple? Would they readily forego their exclusive right to the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the law, and the promises? Rom. ix. 4. Would they not naturally revolt at the introduction of a system which laid the axe to the root of

the tree, substituting inward purity for splendid ceremonies, and a thorough rectification of conduct, a *μετάνοια* of the spirit, for those outward observances, of the efficacy of which they doubted not, since they were prescribed by God himself. The preachers of such a religion as the Gospel, being Jews, would be considered as traitors and blasphemers; and if they particularly assailed the hypocrisy and vices of *Pharisaical* rulers and men in authority, they would draw down on their own heads the whole weight of civil and ecclesiastical power, in addition to the obloquy cast on them by prejudice. How, again, could they endure the ridicule and scorn of *Sadducees*, to whom they proposed the doctrine of resurrection?

It might be expected, perhaps, that the Roman governors then in Jerusalem would look with indifference upon the struggles of two religious parties among a people, both of which they despised, and would be Gallios, caring for none of these things; but when they heard of a leader aspiring to be king of the Jews, and were continually warned of danger lurking under that ambiguous name, they would naturally distrust the pretence of a spiritual kingdom, or not understand it, and look with vigilant suspicion on its supporters and abettors; particularly suspecting sedition among people whose disaffected inquiry was, *Is it LAWFUL to give tribute to Cæsar?* and who abounded in Herodians and Gaulonites, and other insurgents.

In their appeals to the general body of the Gentiles, our Lord and his apostles encountered *new* difficulties. Not that these were reluctant to admit strange gods into their Pantheon of polytheism; but this religion aspired to stand alone, and to exclude all others: it admitted no compromise; it allowed no other worship; it arraigned and derided all Olympus; it would not leave Minerva her Parthenon, or Diana her shrine, or Apollo his oracle, or Praxiteles his breathing image: it was altogether exclusive. This was the ground on which the Jews were already hated and termed atheists, although *they* rather despised idolaters than sought to win them over. What, then, could the Christian teachers expect, who were at first deemed a sect of these turbulent Jews, stirrers up of sedition, turners of the world upside down—whose whole business it was to preach

down those pagan vanities, to labour after a sweeping extirpation of them all, and to establish in their stead the spiritual worship of one invisible God, without a statue, without daily immolations, or any of the pompous ceremonies which were the festivals of idolatry and the encouragers of an hundred trades—from the priest to the butcher, from the silversmith to the swineherd; not to mention the *dilettanti*, who, having no religious principle, mourned over the threatened wreck of the finest architecture and sculpture in the world?

In the schools of philosophy fresh difficulties were encountered; there the great doctrine of resurrection became a laughing-stock. And if we add the self-denying doctrine, the heart-searching and heart-surrendering spirit of the religion recommended, so uninviting to men of this world—if we add the citizenship of heaven, the conversation withdrawn from present certainties, and fixed on remote expectancies—the hope of a future life, to be attained by patient endurance, under stoning, imprisonment, expulsion, stripes till every vein and artery was laid bare, and deaths of transfixion with stakes, or by the combustion of men dipped in pitch and kindled as torches,—all which the early propagators of the Gospel announced to their disciples and exemplified in their own sufferings, we are prepared to rest on the certainty of miraculous support; since nothing less could force the way of the new religion through so many obstacles of pride, sensuality, scepticism, worldly-mindedness, and love of ease.

193. *Works of the Sabbath-day. A Sabbath-day's journey.*

So rigorously did the Jews observe the fourth commandment, that a man gathering sticks in the wilderness in defiance of it was stoned to death, Num. xv. 32: and that even the tenderness of maternal anxiety, the zeal of female friendship and sorrow, abstained from violating the sacred day; for the Marys refrained from a visit to the sepulchre of Christ, having *rested on the seventh day according to the commandment*, Luke xxiii. 56; that is, from the evening of Friday to the evening of Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath. Self-defence, in case of being assailed

by an enemy, was allowed on the Sabbath by Mattathias (1 Mac. ii. 39-41), a thousand Jews having first patiently suffered themselves to be massacred, without the least resistance, on the Sabbath, 1 Mac. ii. 31-38. But even with the new indulgence, they would not on their sacred day impede an enemy's works; on which account Pompey ordered the Roman troops to forbear from an inglorious attack on the Sabbath, but to spend the time in filling up ditches and in planting battering-engines before Jerusalem. In the time of our Saviour, the Jews would water their cattle on the Sabbath, or take an ox or an ass out of a ditch; though they found fault with Christ's healing the sick, and with a man's taking up his bed or mattress, and walking quietly homeward. Christ reminded them of the conduct of David, namely, eating the shew-bread when he was an hungered, which, having been consecrated before the Lord, had become the exclusive property of the priests, 1 Sam. xxi. 6, Matt. xii. 1, &c. By this example he justified his disciples in plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath to appease their hunger, and laid down, or established the first allowable work on the day of the Lord, namely, a work founded on the plea of strict necessity. This was a just indulgence, but a dangerous one; for let no man urge necessity for that which may be done the day before or the day after, or left wholly undone, without danger or much inconvenience. Our Saviour likewise, adverting to the Jewish customs of circumcising a child on the Sabbath-day, when that was the eighth day from the birth, in strict compliance with the law of Moses (Levit. xii. 3), and likewise of offering the extra offerings of the Sabbath according to the order of Num. xxviii. 9, presses the Jews with a different view of the argument: "If ye yourselves admit, that when two laws or ordinances seem to clash, namely, that relating to the Sabbath and that of offering extra burnt-offerings, the former is to yield to the latter, as of greater importance,—and if it be allowed that the priests act upon the principle and are blameless (Matt. xii. 5); then be judged out of your own mouth: where you cannot strictly observe a ritual without setting aside a moral law, give up the mere rite in favour of the grand principle, *Mercy is better than* (legal) *sacrifice*, Hos. vi. 6, 1 Sam. xv. 22, Matt. ix. 13. For if, according

to Prov. xxi. 3, to do justice is better than sacrifice, surely to do mercy must be better, *à fortiori* (Micah vi. 7, 8), always on the supposition that both the duties cannot be united." In allowing and stating the blamelessness of the priests who circumcised and offered sacrifices on the Sabbath, Christ establishes the principle that works of piety may be done blamelessly; and after shewing that it was lawful to heal, to save life, to do good on the Sabbath-day (Luke vi. 9), he makes summary mention of works of strict necessity, of decided piety, and, finally, of charity, as constituting the three Christian allowances of departure from the strict letter of the fourth commandment.

The Jewish Sabbath was a holy convocation to the Lord, Levit. xxiii. 3; that is, people were to assemble round the tabernacle, and afterwards round their synagogues, for the purpose of public worship. Now, as Joshua had fixed two thousand cubits, i. e. three thousand feet, as the distance of the people from the ark and tabernacle, to travel that distance was allowed as necessary; and thus afterwards it became the measure of a Sabbath-day's journey, the more particularly as the suburbs of the Levitical cities extended to the same measurement, Num. xxxv. 5. This is nearly the distance of the Mount of Olives from Jerusalem, as it is stated to be in Acts i. 12. An English mile is 5,280 feet; 3000 feet, or 200 cubits, are therefore 360 feet more than half a mile; for $\frac{5280}{2} = 2640$; and $2640 + 360 = 3000$ feet, or two thousand cubits.

194. *Books of the New Testament for a time regarded as of doubtful authority by the church.*

The Epistle to the Hebrews, that of Jude, the 2d Epistle of Peter, and the 2d and 3d of John, were not universally received in the first century and for some time later; and some churches appear to have received them earlier than others. This, however, says Dr. Burton (*Hist. of Christian Church*, p. 167), only shews the extreme caution which was used in settling questions of this kind. An epistle might be read and acknowledged in one part of the empire, and not for years known to the rest of the world. As Christianity diffused itself, and attracted more

attention, the communication among different churches gave these works a wider circulation, while it supplied the proof of their genuineness. John, however, closed the canon in the Apocalypse; and there can be no doubt that all the books of the New Testament were written before the end of the first century; for *if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him all the plagues that are written in this book*, Rev. xxii. 18; and the establishers of the canon would take especial care that the books latterly introduced bore dates at least preceding this threat.

195. *Evidences for the truth of revelation, external, internal, experimental, and analogical.*

The *external* evidences are—prophecy realised, and miracles performed. Prophecy, in regard to which it is necessary to shew, and has been shewn, that the predictions were uttered long before the facts, and consisted neither of vague conjectures nor of the shrewd forecasts of political sagacity. Miracle, in regard to which it is necessary to shew, and has been shewn, first, that the witnesses laboured under no delusion in regard to the preternatural works they alleged themselves to have witnessed; and, secondly, that they could have no imaginable inducement to proclaim a falsehood ruinous to themselves.

The *internal* evidences are drawn from the inherent excellence of the system—the wisdom of its plan—its originality—the universality of its scope and application—its perfect adaptation to the spiritual wants of mankind—its supply of pardon for their offences, and succour for their frailty—the purity of its precepts—the perfect character of its Founder—its tendency to meliorate the heart, and advance the present and eternal welfare of man—the utter improbability of such a plan having been conceived by uneducated Jews, and accomplished naturally by a small unprotected band—the entire change of character it tends to produce, and does produce, in true penitents who embrace it.

To these evidences we are to add the rapid and extraordinary success of the Gospel; for here we behold a religion flattering no passion—disdaining alliance with any adverse principle—

setting itself against the maxims and manners of the world—preaching self-denial—affording no earthly advantage, nay, promising to converts tribulation, persecution, loss of all things, loss of life—carrying no armour but that of holiness, no sword but that of the Spirit—combating the power of the civil magistrate, the pride of the philosopher, the interest of the pagan, and prejudices of the Jewish priesthood, and the worldly views of all mankind—and substituting for the pompous ceremonies and skin-deep external observances of idolatry, a heart of inward purity, responding to the search of an omniscient and holy God. We behold this religion, in less than sixty years after its Founder had been put to death as a malefactor, becoming formidable to the Roman empire, crowned with the deaths of thousands of exulting martyrs, and confessed by multitudes in all the countries of the then known world.

And what an improvement, what a revolution, has it produced in the principles, the worship, the morals, the welfare, temporal and eternal, of mankind! The altars of idolatry, the temples of polytheism—where are they? Bel boweth down—Nebo stoopeth; and men every where worship the one God, the Father, who is a Spirit, in spirit and in truth. We have one sacrifice, the dying Redeemer; one altar, which is a contrite heart; one offering, which is the fruits of penitence. The horrors of war are softened, the fetters of slavery relaxed; polygamy, child-murder, gladiatorial combats, own, by their cessation or remission, the mild spirit of Christianity, like stars paling their ineffectual fires before the Sun of righteousness; and charity, in all its forms, is the brilliance of the Redeemer's diadem. Heaven is opened, and the tabernacle of God is with man.

There is another species of internal evidence, called the *experimental*, which, rightly understood, is of no mean force. *Not* that undoubting assurance of salvation which generates haughty contempt and affected pity of the humbled penitent who smites his breast and walks humbly with his God—*not* that reliance on inward lights, and transports, and feelings, the *ignes fatui* of Satan; but that consciousness which the humbled and convinced sinner, restored to the peace of the Holy Spirit, feels,

that a religion so blissful in its tendencies and effects on his personal renewal, bears the indisputable marks of divine origin — that conviction of its truth which rises up in the mind, after submitting itself to its doctrines and precepts as a trial, in order to improve its yet imperfect belief. It finds its proof in the exercise. That *must* be true which so marvellously transforms. This is the witness of the Spirit — the joint working of God's Spirit and our spirit, proving us to be the children of God. This exemplifies the promise, *If any man will do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God*, John vii. 17.

If now we ask, what are the *analogical* evidences of the truth of revelation?—we may take the first from God's providential care over his creatures. He every where proportions their powers to their wants; he gives them whatever knowledge is needful to their well-being: but he gives them no more. He implants no instinct without the means of finding its object; and supplies no notions of things unattainable or unreal.

Now, man is here on earth capable of speculating on the ideas of a God, and time and space, and other worlds—subjects unknown to the lower creation. He possesses a moral sense, a notion of right and wrong, prostrates himself before an invisible power, and hopes and trembles at an hereafter: but on all these subjects his knowledge is imperfect and his researches are hemmed in. We conclude, that the Author of his nature would not have made him capable of such notions, without imparting some fuller knowledge on matters so important to him; and hence the probability of a revelation rises into a certainty. The human mind has conceptions and capacities of knowledge and enjoyment far beyond what it can attain in this brief and troubled state. Would God have formed a vessel of these large dimensions, only to pour into it a scantling of contents? Where, in all the analogies of nature, does he so disproportion the powers to the actual efforts—the vessel to the intended contents? As to man's sentiments of responsibility, his power of choosing between moral good and evil, and his hopes and fears thence arising, we cannot believe that such conceptions would have been permitted to enter his mind, if they did not point to substantialities, to a real accountability, and state of reward and

punishment; and if so, God would no doubt confirm these notions by certain declarations—as, *that he hath appointed a day when he will judge the world in righteousness.*

But again, for every want, and inconvenience, and natural evil, there is a remedy. Every animal has its instincts, which lead to a supply of its wants; God feedeth the young ravens, and providently caters for the sparrow. If man comes naked into the world, there is clothing of fig-leaves and of skins; if he has no shelter, he constructs a hut or bower; if hungry or thirsty, there are fruits and springs; if wounded, there is balm; if sick, the Lord hath prepared medicines of the earth.

But where is the remedy for moral evil? There is a great moral evil in native depravity, and in the sins to which it impels men, and in their frailty unable to resist its impulses. *There* is the moral evil, and *here* is the remedy: Christ, the propitiation for sin, and the Holy Spirit, the strengthener of the frailty. *Analogically*, this remedy is as clearly to be expected from God, as that bark, or mercury, or sarsaparilla, should exist as correctives of the diseases for which they are specifics.

But as these physical remedies will do good only to those who believe in their efficacy, and consequently resort to them in illness, it is reasonable to suppose, by analogy, that the *moral* remedies are only available to the faith which worketh by love, and to the prayer that asks for the Holy Spirit, and the compliance which resists not its influences.

Here, then, are various analogical evidences in support of the leading doctrines of the Gospel. The Trinity is a mystery, baffling analogy; but yet, if my sins are to be forgiven, and my feebleness invigorated, it seems necessary, or in the highest degree satisfactory (according to the general analogy by which Providence adapts and proportions remedies to wants), that there should be no higher powers in the universe than the power which procures the forgiveness and that which bestows the succour; that they should not be “angels, chargeable with folly”—imperfect creatures, having no atoning virtue or succouring aid to spare.

196. Ἡνάγκαζον βλασφημεῖν (Acts xxvi. 11): *why was not ἡνάγκασα used here?*

"*I was compelling, I strove to compel the disciples to blaspheme; but they refused; my persecutions were impotent.*" The imperfect tense was more proper than any other.

197. Seniores plebis, and primus inter pares: *state the meaning.*

The elders in the church of Scotland are *seniores plebis*, and the moderator of the General Assembly is *primus inter pares*: a presbyter, or elder, in England is a *senior in ecclesia*; and the archbishop of Canterbury is the primate of all England, but, among presbyters, not *inter pares*.

198. *Specify some of the principal means whereby the Spirit of God sanctifies the sons of men.*

I. BAPTISM. *For by one Spirit we are all baptised into one body*, 1 Cor. xii. 13, Rom. vi. 4.

II. LORD'S SUPPER. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no (spiritual) life in you*, John vi. 53. *He was known to them in breaking of bread*, Luke xxiv. 35. *I am the bread of life*—the spiritual nutriment of the soul; *I am the true vine*—the Spirit grafting in the branches.

III. PRAYER. *For your heavenly Father will give his Holy Spirit unto them that ask him*, Luke xi. 13.

IV. THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. *Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth*, John xvii. 17. *The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life*, John vi. 63. *The holy Scriptures, which are able (through the Spirit) to make wise unto salvation*, 2 Tim. iii. 15.

V. PREACHING. *It pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching (applied by the Spirit) to save them that believe*, 1 Cor. i. 21.

VI. MEDITATION. *I thought on my ways, and turned my feet unto thy testimonies*, Psalm cxix. 59. *And when he came to himself, he said, I will arise and go to my father*, Luke xv. 17, 18. Both resolutions were moved by the Spirit of God.

Examples: Isaac, who went out into the fields to meditate in the eventide; and our Lord, who passed whole nights in the proseuchæ.

VII. AFFLICTION. *Before I was afflicted I went astray; but now have I kept thy word*, Psalm cxix. 67, 71. *Chastening yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness*, Heb. xii. 11. *In the day of adversity consider*, Eccles. vii. 14.

VIII. DEJECTED SPIRITS. *By the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better*, Eccles. vii. 3. *Godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation*, 2 Cor. vii. 10.

IX. CONFIRMATION. *Then laid they hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost*, Acts viii. 17. Christ laid his hands on children, Matt. xix. 15.

X. THE REMOVAL OF FRIENDS, OR VISITING SCENES OF DISTRESS. *It is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men, and the living will lay it to heart*, Eccles. vii. 2.

XI. ADVANCEMENT IN LIFE. *Cast me not off in the time of old age; forsake me not when my strength faileth*, Ps. lxxi. 9. *How long have I to live, that I should go up with the king to Jerusalem? Let me die in mine own city*, 2 Sam. xix. 35, 37.

XII. SOLITUDE. *When I remember thee upon my bed, and meditate upon thee in the night-watches*, Ps. lxxiii. 9. *The Lord was in the still small voice*, 1 Kings xix. 12. *If I take the wings of the morning, even there shall thy hand lead me*, Ps. cxxxix. 16. Example: Peter on the house-top praying; John in Patmos.

All these are means of grace. In every religious exercise we wait upon God for his sanctifying influences. *But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will*, 1 Cor. xii. 11.

199. *Arguments in proof of our Lord's divinity, derived from the objections of the Jews themselves to his discourse.*

He himself answered many of their objections: as, when they accused him of raising up devils through Beelzebub, he replied, that if the prince of evil had given him power, it would no doubt have been to work evil; but as his works were good, they indicated that God was with him. Now, as he called him-

self the Messiah, who fulfilled the prophets; the *Emmanuel*, *God with us*; the Yea and Amen, the First and the Last; as he identifies himself with God, saying distinctly, *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father*,—we are sure that God would not have given him the power of working these miracles in support of a falsehood. Again, when the Jews urged, *Thou art not yet forty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?* his words, *Before Abraham was, I am*, plainly alluded to the title assumed at the burning bush, and proved that he himself was that same *Angel* of the Lord (not that first Person, whom no man hath seen or can see at any time; but the Son, who came from the bosom of the Father, to reveal or declare the Father); the Angel, or Messenger of the covenant, who called himself, in that interview, the *I am*—the self-existent Being, in the Septuagint *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*—the *God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob*, Exod. iii. 16. Once more, when the Jews said, *For a good work we stone thee not, but because thou, being a man, makest thyself God*, he vindicated himself by such an argument as they in their then infuriated state would hear. Is it not written in your law, *I said ye are gods?* (Ps. lxxxii. 6), as spoken concerning earthly and mortal judges, and therefore no blasphemy in him, even by their own shewing. But this was only an answer to stop the unreasonable clamour of inveterate foes. The real case was, that our Lord came into the world to answer the descriptions of prophecy, by being God and *man*; the Lord, who should suddenly come to his Temple, Mal. iii. 4; and the man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, Isa. liii. 3; the Lord, the Son, to whom God said, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, Ps. xlv. 6; and the man, whom they that saw him should shake the head at, and laugh to scorn, Ps. xxii. 7; the man who wrestled with Jacob, and the God who *blessed* Jacob, Gen. xxxii. 24, &c.; the Son, whom a virgin should conceive, and whose name should be the mighty God, Isa. vii. 14, ix. 6.

So much puzzled were the Jews with these seemingly contradictory prophecies, that they invented the hypothesis of two Messiahs—one to suffer, and another to reign. See article 162.

200. *What is the criterion of inspiration? and is the Bible an inspired composition?*

A teacher or a writer, professing to be inspired, must bring proofs of the delegation of supernatural power, or communication of superhuman knowledge; that is, he must either work miracles, or utter prophecies, of which some partial accomplishment must produce confident trust in the whole. His communications must likewise relate to matters of moment, and to matters which human research, unaided, would be incompetent to discover or ascertain.

Now, Moses gained credit for the inspiration of the Pentateuch by working miracles in Egypt and the wilderness: and some of the prophecies, such as the death of Korah, &c., being fulfilled in his lifetime, inspired confidence in his predictions of remote events. What could be more important, or less discernible by human research, than the history of the creation, and the fall; the promise of a restoration; the setting forth of those laws, which were to be the guides of conduct to the people of God, whether for this world or the next? The writers of most of the other books of the Bible either wrought miracles or uttered prophecies relating to the Messiah—the inspiration of which has been sealed by the fulfilment, in his coming, but had been confidently expected by reason of an inferior fulfilment in some characters or events in the Jewish history. These infidelity has laid hold of, as the only fulfilment intended; but they were rather given as earnest, to sustain confidence in a distant and grander substantiation—to which alone parts of those prophecies could relate, having, in the first and inferior fulfilment, what Hooker calls a springing and germinant accomplishment. David could say of Solomon that his reign should be peace; but of a greater than Solomon it was added, that that peace should extend throughout all generations: and Isaiah might say of Josiah, that unto us a son was born; but of another, that he was the everlasting Father, the mighty God, of whose reign there should be no end.

Some historical books of Scripture can only boast an inferior inspiration, which consists in Divine superintendence over the

writers, such as should preclude any material error; but being published by Ezra, who himself also acted under the influence of the Holy Spirit, the Jews took his word for it, as we must do, that these books were inspired, or guarded against error by particular providence.

201. *Do any classical writers mention pools similar to that of Bethesda? Does the style of the narrative in John v. 2 prove the writer to have been a Jew?*

Baiæ was celebrated for its warm-baths; "non tantum corpori, sed etiam moribus salubrem locum eligere debemus." *Seneca ad Lucil. epist. 52.* — "Seu liquidæ placuere Baiæ." *Hor. lib. iii. od. 4.* — "Calentibus aquis, ad sanitatem valde utilibus." *Schol. on Hor. lib. ii. od. 18.* — Callirrhoë, warm springs, not far from Machærus, in the Dead Sea, and a fountain of the same name in Attica, mentioned by *Statius, lib. xii. lin. 609,* "Et quos Callirrhoë novis errantibus undis implicat."

"Callirrhoë, fons in Palestina calidus, ac morbis sanandis saluberrimus, in quo Herodes, morbo horribili ac prorsus desperato et cœlitus immisso laborans, perperam se ipsum lavit, propter tot ac tanta in homines scelera inhumaniter perpetrata; itemque prope hunc fontem sita est hujus nominis civitas, quæ quondam Lece vocabatur." *Joseph. Antiq. Jud. lib. xvii. lin. 8; Stephan. Diction., art. Callirrhoë.*

That this *κολυμβήθρα*, or *swimming-pool*, was called in the Hebrew language *Bethesda*, *בֵּית הַחַסְדִּים*, *the house of mercy*, is information likely to have come from a Jew, acquainted with the Syro-Chaldaic, then spoken in Jerusalem, and called by him *ἰβραϊστί*; but the nation of the writer is further known from his acquaintance with the Jewish objections to carrying any burden on the Sabbath, and the custom of attributing any phenomenon, for which they could not account, to *angels*. The nation of the writer was further known from his relation of the interview between the object of the miracle and Christ in the Temple, that being the place to which the former would naturally repair to return thanks after his wonderful recovery: and from a critical acquaintance with the Scriptures, and reference to Moses as having spoken concerning Christ, the prophet like

unto Moses, to whom the Jews should hearken ; for although that reference was made by our Lord himself, it is not probable that any other narrator than a converted Jew would have explained the passage alluded to (Deut. xviii. 15), by saying that Moses wrote of Christ, John v. 45, 46. Of this there is another example in Stephen, Acts vii. 37, 38.

202. *Was a community of goods enforced by the apostles as a principle generally applicable to Christian communities ? What does the article of our church state on this point ?*

It does not appear that *the having all things in common* was enjoined on even the earliest disciples to the letter. It was the use—that of distribution—not the possession, that was in common ; and that the power of sale was voluntary, and that only part was disposed of, or distributed as the poorer brethren had need, seems clear from the story of Ananias and Sapphira : *while it remained, was it not thine own ? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power ?* In the epistles we find charges to them that are rich, that they be ready to give and glad to distribute, and other exhortations to alms-giving ; which supposes inequalities of property in the Christians, since these exhortations would be idle under an entire equality of possessions. And even St. Paul's *though I give all my goods to feed the poor*—literally, “distribute my possessions in meals”—is only a supposed and extreme case, not an injunction ; but, like *giving the body to be burned* (1 Cor. xiii. 3), a sacrifice to be cheerfully made, if the exigence should demand it. See Pridden *on the Early Christians*.

But even though it were otherwise, and there were a strict community of possessions among the early Christians, that which might be required in an infant and persecuted church, when the disciples forsook all to follow their Lord, when they incurred the hatred and anathemas of their Jewish kindred, forfeited upon principle the sources of their livelihood, and could look for no support out of their own community,—could be no rule beyond a reasonable injunction to charity for a more peaceable and settled state of the Christian church, wherein the stimulus to

industry would by such community of goods be taken away, and men would place religion in an indolent quietism or monkish mendicancy. Why, if such were not the case, should the New Testament abound in exhortations to the disciples to work with their hands, 1 Thess. iv. 11; and to walk honestly, Rom. xiii. 13; backed by the example of Paul and Aquila the tent-makers, and Simon the tanner, and Lydia the seller of purple; and confirmed by the declarations, that he that *would not work, neither should he eat*, 2 Thess. iii. 10; and that *if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel*, 1 Tim. v. 8. Collections were made among the *rich* for the use of the *poor*, 1 Cor. xvi. 1: the distinction, then, was not abolished.

Doddridge says, that a more near approach to a strict community of goods was made at this time, when sojourners at Jerusalem would wish to remain there some time to obtain a more perfect knowledge of the truth, and when all believed in the approaching fulfilment of the prophecy relating to the destruction of Jerusalem (and with it, as they supposed, the end of the world), which would level all distinctions. The Essenes had a complete community of goods; and their principles had some influence afterwards, as appeared in the converted Ascetics and Therapeutæ, and other cenobite Christians.

The thirty-eighth article of our church was pointed against Muncer and the earlier Anabaptists, who, in 1525, mingled their notions of a community of goods with civil disturbances. The article prescribes giving with liberality out of every man's possessions, but not a common property. And in vain, as we have already shewn, will political heretics search for a case in the primitive church—or if a case, still less a precedent.

203. *What do you understand by irrespective decrees, election, irresistible grace, and perseverance?*

As all visionary and delusive; as leading, by direct consequence, to Antinomianism; as not supported by Scripture or reason; as tending to presumption or despair; as establishing a Christian Phariseism, by which men trust in themselves that they are righteous, and that, being saved beyond the possibility

of a doubt, they may rest on their oars, as if they were already in port ;—while they despise, or deem lost, those humble Christians who are crying for mercy, and owning themselves unworthy to be called sons ; who have learned to *fear* God, because there is forgiveness with him ; not to grieve the Holy Spirit of God, whereby they are sealed (as a Christian *people*) ; who, standing, must take heed lest they fall ; who make their calling and election (election as a *people* favoured with the Gospel) sure, that is, in its application to their individual case ; who work out their salvation with fear and trembling, while God is working in and with them ; and who ever remember, that it is he that endureth unto the *end* that shall be saved.

So I should say at the first glance ; but when I think of the omniscience, including the prescience, of God, who must know all things, past, present, and to come, I confess the whole to be an awful mystery, and speak of it with suitable diffidence ; having only a certain trust in the moral attributes of God, who would not, I think, do what in any of his fallen creatures would be stamped as unmerciful and unjust — nay, who recognises this native sentiment, in his interview with Abraham, as the rule of his own conduct : *Wilt thou destroy equally righteous and wicked ? shall not the Judge of all the earth do right ?* Answer : *I will not destroy the city, for ten's sake.* Rather than give a positive answer to this question, therefore, I should desire, like Burnet, to state the arguments on both sides, and leave the conclusion to others ; with Watts, to pronounce, that since we are assured, by reason and Scripture, both of human free-will and Divine fore-knowledge, we may justly believe them both (*Logic*, p. 256, though I don't see the *logic* of this) ; or to say, with Simeon, that Calvinists would wish Scripture to contain fewer Arminian likelihoods, and Arminians fewer Calvinistic ones. And as to the Thirty-nine Articles, I dare not say a conscientious Calvinist may not subscribe them : I only claim the same right for a conscientious Arminian. For myself, I fall back on the last clause of the seventeenth article, which states that the promises of God are to be received as they are *generally* set forth in Scripture ; well remembering that *there* God is described as willing that all men should be saved, and that not any

should perish. I feel that all scriptural injunctions to prayer, and exhortations to holiness, stultify Calvinism; and that the host of hopes and fears, relative to conduct, excited in Scripture, at least shew nothing to be absolutely and irrevocably pre-determined. I am sure that human option comports with the whole scope of Scripture, and is indispensable to a state of probation. I would then say, with an English philosopher, that "we have the evidence of consciousness for our free-agency; but that to reason on prescience is to aspire to a subject above our faculties;" D. Stewart, *Active Powers*, appendix to vol. ii. I would say, with Cicero, "Libertatis autem et indifferentiæ quæ in nobis est, nos ita conscios esse, ut nihil sit quod evidentius et perfectius comprehendamus. Absurdum enim esset, propterea quod non comprehendimus unam rem, quam scimus ex natura sua nobis *debere esse incomprehensibilem*, de alia dubitare quam intime comprehendimus, atque apud nosmet ipsos experimur." Finally, and above all, I would add, that there is a way of dwelling on the prescience of God which obscures his moral attributes.

204. *Brief history of the Reformation. What title was then conferred by the pope? on whom? and for what?*

Pope Leo X., in order to supply his extravagances, and to complete the building of St. Peter's at Rome, instituted a sale of indulgences, or releases from the pains of purgatory. For this purpose he sent Tetzel, a Dominican friar, into Germany; who was strenuously opposed by MARTIN LUTHER, an Augustine monk, jealous (his enemies say) of that lucrative traffic being taken away from his own order. In declaiming against indulgences, and the papal authority in vending them, he found many willing hearers, and a patron in Frederic Elector of Saxony, A.D. 1517. Leo X. condemned Luther's tenets by a bull, which only exasperated the more his angry and determined spirit. In a work termed the *Babylonish Captivity*, he applied to the papal hierarchy all the attributes of the whore of Babylon, and assailed not only purgatory, but transubstantiation, the celibacy of the priesthood, and the refusal of the cup to the laity. This book

was condemned to the flames; and Luther, in recrimination, burnt the pope's bull and the decretals at Wittenburg, A.D. 1520. This is the era of reviving the doctrine of justification by faith only in the sole merits of the Saviour, the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*.

The Reformation now flowed on like a torrent, and the united powers of the pope and emperor Charles V. were unable to stem its progress. Charles made the attempt by summoning Luther to a diet at Worms, A.D. 1521. He accepted the invitation, saying, "Thither will I go, in the name of the Lord, though as many devils as tiles on the houses were assembled against me." Here he was caressed, admired, and joined by the professors of many universities and the princes of many states. Luther at the diet acknowledged his vehemence, but refused to retract his opinions, rejecting a trial of them by any other standard than that of Scripture. On his journey hither, he composed a paraphrase on the 46th psalm, and set it to the music of his celebrated hymn. From Worms he retired to the castle of Wurtzburgh, which he called his Patmos, and there printed his translation of the New Testament. The states of Saxony having embraced the doctrines of the Reformation A.D. 1525, terms of accommodation were proposed, at the diet of Spires, between the Lutherans and Catholics, A.D. 1529; but fourteen German cities and several electors protested formally against these articles, and thus acquired for the Lutheran party the name of *Protestants*. In the year following, A.D. 1530, a confession of the Protestant faith, drawn up by Melancthon, the able friend and coadjutor of Luther, was presented to the diet of Augsburg; and this has been called the boast of Germany, and held to be the standard of the Protestant doctrines. It was followed next year by the league of Smalcald, for mutual defence, among the Protestant states. Luther used his new privilege of emancipation by marrying a nun, who bore to him several children. One of these, Magdalene, died before him, and he read to her Isa. xxvi. 19, *Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise, &c.*; adding, "My daughter, enter thou into thy chamber in peace: I shall ere long be with thee."

Luther spent three hours every day in private devotion, saying that temptation, meditation, and prayer, fitted ministers for usefulness. He died in A.D. 1546.

In the meantime Zuinglius, A.D. 1520, preached the doctrine of the Reformation successfully throughout Zurich, Berne, Basle, and other cantons, wherein the mass was abolished. His opinions on the sacrament differed from those of Luther. He differed from Luther, as to considering the eucharist to be the *verus panis et verum corpus Christi*,—denying the presence of Christ therein in any sense, and affirming the elements to be mere signs and remembrances; but Bucer and Melancthon softened down these sentiments. The Catholic cantons taking arms, Zuinglius was slain A.D. 1531, his last words being,—“They kill the body, but they cannot touch the soul.” He was succeeded in the church of Zurich by Bullinger, who died A.D. 1578, saying, “Socrates desired to be with Homer and Hesiod; I go to Christ and his apostles, and to be with patriarchs, prophets, and all holy men.”

Calvin took up the Swiss reformation after the death of Zuinglius, and published his celebrated Institutes at Basle, A.D. 1535. In the year following he settled at Geneva, and corrected the doctrine of Zuinglius in three important points.

1. Zuinglius had subjected the clergy to the civil magistrate, and allowed of orders, and a superintendent in the church. Calvin made the church an independent body, and established the regular system of Presbyterianism; he gave to the clergy a perfect parity of rank and office; and restored to the church the power of excommunication. This was afterwards disputed in Germany by Erastus.

2. Calvin allowed a spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament, to be discerned by faith, which united true believers to Jesus; and here he is followed by the English church, in opposition to the notions of Zuinglius, whose followers were called Sacramentarians.

3. Calvin introduced the absolute decrees of God, which are now the distinctive mark of those who call themselves his followers. Beza was the assistant of Calvin—the colleague, as they call that office in Scotland.

The Marian persecutions brought a number of English Protestants to Geneva; and these, on their return, imported Calvinism into England, though some of them were still high-churchmen in discipline. Calvin died 1564.

Among others returned the celebrated JOHN KNOX, who was a strong, coarse, thorough radical in church-reformation, with more zeal than discretion, and (to speak phrenologically) born with the organ of destructiveness. He had been preceded by Hamilton, Wishart, Russell, and others, who suffered by the persecutions of Cardinal Beaton. Knox, with Ralph and Ebenezer Erskine, introduced the Presbyterian form of church-government into Scotland, starting off at an obtuse, and not at a right angle, from the ancient church—not reforming abuses with a cautious hand, but laying the axe to the root of the tree. A war was waged against all those wonderful structures the cathedrals, and the abbeys and monasteries were exterminated. “Set fire,” said Knox, “to the trees, and the rooks will fly out.” A sour religion, and an equality of mediocrity, both in endowments and in possessions, has been inherited from this man: while the English church has her Butlers, Horsleys, Warburtons, &c., and elevates her dignitaries to the very platform of the throne.

Henry the Eighth was a reformer in only a few points: the rejection of the authority of the pope; the assumption of the spoliation of the church into his own hands; and the permission granted to circulate the Bible in the vernacular tongue. In all other respects he lived and died a Catholic. He was, however, in a fit of good humour when he did not take offence at Latimer’s presenting him with a Testament folded down at the text, *Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge*. He wrote a book against Luther, and in favour of transubstantiation, which being presented to Leo the Tenth, procured for him from that pontiff the title of *Defender of the Faith*. The date of the Reformation in England is A.D. 1534, but Henry died 1547; and Edward the Sixth carried on the work with some earnestness during the six short years of his reign. Cranmer and Ridley were his chief instruments; the latter, in a sermon, inducing him to establish Christ’s hospital, Bridewell, and Bartholomew’s

— for the education of the uninstructed, the punishment of the lazy, and the healing of the sick. Edward passed to a better world at the age of sixteen, A.D. 1553; and was succeeded by Mary, whose reign was marked by bigotry and ferocity, and brought back the Reformation to the point from which it had set out. In 1558 Elizabeth ascended the throne, and established the Protestant religion in a hierarchy as to discipline, and in its orthodox moderation as to doctrine.

ARTICLES

Were first published by Henry VIII. in 1536, partly popish and partly protestant. They were succeeded by forty-two articles of Edward VI. in 1552, agreed to in convocation, having been drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley, who followed the Augsburg confession. Thirty-nine articles were next set forth by Elizabeth in 1562, and being approved of by the convocations of both provinces, were published in Latin. The three articles omitted related (the 40th) to the intermediate state, allowing prayers for the dead; (the 41st) against the millennarians; and (the 42d) against the universalists. Other alterations from Edward's articles related to the apocrypha, as read *not* for doctrine; the right of a church to appoint rites in subjection to Scripture; and a refutation of the corporeal presence, much compressed. The descent into hell is left to a latitude of interpretation. The thirty-nine articles were revised, and trifling alterations made, in 1591, when they were published in Latin and English.

The nine articles of Lambeth, highly Calvinistic, were published by Whitgift, a Calvinist in doctrine, and high episcopalian in discipline, A.D. 1592; but they were never agreed to.

HOMILIES.

The First Book was set forth in the reign of Edward VI., A.D. 1547, written by Cranmer, with the help of Ridley, from 1 to 12, inclusive.

The Second Book, in the reign of Elizabeth, A.D. 1562, was composed by Jewel, from 13 to 33 inclusive.

CANONS AND CONSTITUTIONS ECCLESIASTICAL.

These were drawn up by the province of Canterbury, and licensed by the king in the reign of James, A.D. 1603.

LITURGY.

The first elements of the Liturgy in the vulgar tongue consisted in the Godly Institution of a Christian Man, and were published by Henry VIII., A.D. 1537; and improved into the Necessary Doctrine and Erudition, A.D. 1540.

The King's Primer, or Morning and Evening Prayer, a reformation of the ancient Latin service, drawn up by a committee of bishops and other divines, was published, in English, A.D. 1545. Henry VIII. died A.D. 1547.

In 1547 Edward VI. added a service for communion in both kinds, and appointed a commission for drawing up services for Sundays and holydays, with forms of baptism, confirmation, matrimony, burial, and other occasional offices, the whole of which were confirmed by Parliament in A.D. 1548. This commission was composed of Cranmer, Ridley, and eleven dignitaries. But, in 1550, some having complained of imperfection in the work, Cranmer revised it, with the aid of Bucer and Peter Martyr, when the sentences, exhortations, confession, and absolution, were added, the commandments inserted in the communion-service, and several rites removed, viz. oil in confirmation, and unction of the sick; and some prayers expunged—as, prayers for departed souls, invocations of the Holy Ghost at the consecration of the eucharist, and the prayer of oblation following it. The rubric ordering water to be mixed with the wine was expunged; and a rubric added, to explain the custom of kneeling at the sacrament. The habits prescribed formerly were laid aside; and the whole was confirmed by parliament 1551, with the declaration, that the alterations were made *from curiosity*, rather than any worthy cause. This and the act of 1548 were both repealed by Mary, A.D. 1552; but Elizabeth set aside the repeal, and appointed another council of ten divines, including Archbishop Parker, with Sandys and Grindall, to make a new revisal, A.D. 1558. Here several of the Sunday lessons were altered—[would that they had made a still choicer selection!]—and a service was compounded

out of the two Books of Edward. The petition for deliverance "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities" was laid aside, as superseded by the progression in reformation already made; and to the prayer for the sovereign were added the words, "May he be strengthened in the true worshipping of Thee, in righteousness and holiness of life." The two clauses, "the body of our Lord Jesus Christ," and, "the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," were restored from the First Book, and united to the words of the Second, "take, eat (or drink) this." After all, our present sacramental forms have rather an ambiguous meaning. The body and blood of Christ are not distinctly said to be in the eucharist—a solemn wish only expressed that they may preserve each communicant. The first rubric of the Second Book of Edward concerning the situation of the chancel, and the proper place for reading divine service, was altered. The habits to be worn by the clergy were restored from the First Book; and at the end of the Litany were added the two prayers for the king and the clergy. The rubric of the Second Book against the corporeal presence was expunged. The queen wished to unite the nation, and to conciliate the Catholics, *who never would be conciliated.*

Thus the Liturgy continued until the Hampton Court conference under James I. in 1603, where the thanksgiving at the end of the Litany, and the part of the Catechism relating to the sacrament, were introduced. The words "LAWFUL MINISTER" were inserted in the rubric for the office of private baptism. Immediately after the Restoration, Charles II. committed to twenty-one divines on the Episcopalian side, and twenty-one on the Presbyterian, a new review of the Liturgy. Of the former were Sheldon, Sanderson, Walton, Heylin; of the latter, Reynolds, Manton, Calamy, Baxter, Bates, and Lightfoot. This was the Savoy conference, which broke up in consequence of Baxter's saying, "The Liturgy was too bad to be mended." At the subsequent convocation some lessons were substituted for others less proper "for the day." The prayers for particular occasions were disjoined from the Liturgy; and those for the ember-weeks, the parliament, and all conditions of men, with the general thanksgiving, were added. Several collects

were likewise inserted; the epistles and gospels, but not the reading psalms, taken from the last translation of the Bible; while the forms of baptism for riper years, and the prayers to be used at sea, were introduced. The whole received the sanction of convocation and parliament A.D. 1661.

205. *What are the clergy bound to by subscription to the Articles?*

They are bound to believe and to preach what they subscribe. But if there be ambiguous expressions, they are to consider with due caution, 1st, The *animus imponentis*. This is first to be gathered from the state of church-matters at the time of the publication, which was that of being endangered by popery, anabaptism, and puritanism, or hostility to episcopal government. The articles are to be construed, therefore, as distinctly opposed to these notions. In some sense, however, the articles are to be construed as framed for every age and state of the church. 2d, Ministers are to consider the private sentiments of the framers of the articles respecting other matters of permanent importance and interest. Now predestination was not a matter much in discussion when the articles were framed; but we suppose that an aversion from the popish doctrines of merit would impart a tendency to propose the doctrines of grace in the strongest and even overstrained form; besides, Cranmer and Ridley, who chiefly composed the articles, were not predestinarians in the high Calvinistic sense. Cranmer, in particular, warns men not to impute their vice or damnation to God, but to their *own free will*; and Ridley, in his Commentary on the Ephesians, sets forth salvation as *common to all-men*. 3d, Articles are to be compared with one another: the 17th, for example, by the 16th, which admits of a fall from grace given, and the openness of repentance to every sinner so fallen; and with the 31st, which mentions a satisfaction for the sins of the *whole world*. 4th, In ambiguous cases recourse is to be had to that clause in the 17th article, which says, "The promises of God are to be received as they are generally set forth in Scripture; and in *our doings* that will of God is to be followed which is expressly declared in the word of God." Now the Scripture

abounds with invitations and warnings—all of them implying option, and all of them absurd, if the fate of every man is settled before the creation; and further it is said that God is not willing that *any* should perish, but that *all* should come to repentance.

206. Men truly inspired ought to have some sign to convince the world that they are sent and directed by God.

The world would otherwise deny their authority, and deride their communication; irreligion would ask the unsanctioned teacher, Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us? and entrench itself in refusal to hear, by a charge of enthusiasm or imposture in the speaker. Purity of life would obviate the charge of imposture, but not that of personal delusion. Apparent disinterestedness would not gain credit, for men may have other motives than gain, and fanaticism is its own motive; neither could the power of prophecy serve the turn of the instructors, for prophecy is not credited till the event fulfils the prediction. A sign, therefore, or the power of miraculous agency is requisite to support the claims to inspiration. But if this sign truly belonged to one inspired teacher, it might be still necessary, though in an inferior degree, to support the claims of his immediate followers, although from him they derived their doctrines, vouched with their lives for *his* signs, and identified their system with his. But with *their* deaths, the signs, the vouchers for inspiration in the writers, ceased,—having done their work.

207. How do you prove that the idea of an all-powerful Being, the Creator of all things, cannot be banished from the human mind?

From the universal consent of nations, ancient and modern, civilised and savage, in religious worship, which, if it be not instinctive or aboriginally traditional, must result from experience of their own helplessness, and their awe of an unseen omnipotent Cause, which rolls the thunders, controls the raging of the elements, and preserves the planets in their courses:

conscience also accusing or excusing (nor can it be banished or suppressed), refers plainly to the amenableness of man to a superior power; and this voice is peculiarly strong at the hour of death, when, if there were no Almighty Being to call men to account, there would be ground for neither hope nor fear.

208. *Give a derivation of the word church.*

Kyplov olkos: in Scotland, *kirk*.

209. *Distinguish between faith and science, and between human and divine faith.*

Science is assent to what is demonstrated—to conclusions derived from known laws or principles. *Faith* is assent to propositions on the credible testimony of the propounders, or on reasoning upon what, in the nature of things, is likely to be revealed to man's ignorance and wants, from above. *It is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen*, in reliance on the authenticity of the sources of information, on the tried veracity of the preachers, or on reasonings based on the strongest probabilities.

Human faith is assent to human evidence, and relates to worldly concerns: as—I believe in such a country as China, on the ground of the description given by many travellers and mariners.

Divine faith is assent to the word of God, and relates to matters of the eternal world. It presupposes a belief in the Bible as the word of God. Faith, both human and divine, implies acting as if we were assured as to the reality of the objects of faith.

If I really believe in God, I shall obey him: if I believe the Bible to be the word of God, I shall act according to its principles.

*210. *To what event did the prophet allude in Matt. ii. 18? and how was Rachel connected with Rama in Bethlehem?*

Rachel never *literally* "mourned for her children, because they were not," for she had but two children, and died in giving

birth to the second. The prophecy alluded to by St. Matthew is that in Jeremiah xxxi. 15, where Rachel the mother of Benjamin is figuratively put for Jerusalem in the tribe of Benjamin. As Rama signifies *height*, it is mentioned in several places as indicating names of towns. But the Ramah of Rachel's death is that of 1 Kings xv., and is mentioned by Josephus, Eusebius, and Jerome, as about six miles north of Jerusalem, near Bethel; and is that mentioned in Judges (xix. 13) as the place to which the Levite, going from Bethlehem and passing by Jerusalem, thought of lodging for the night, though he preferred the adjoining town of Gibeah of Benjamin.

Rachel died in the way from Bethel to Ephrath (*the fruitful*), which is Bethlehem. She was carried forward to the spot near Bethlehem, where Jacob set a pillar over her grave, which remained in the days of Moses. But the monument now shewn as her memorial is a Turkish building.

Rachel weeping for her children, because they are not, signifies, then, Jerusalem personified as the mother of Benjamin, and mourning over her sons carried into captivity, and thus said to be dead, *ὅτι οὐκ εἶσι*: and by *then was thus fulfilled*, is meant, then (A.D. 1) did the *complete* fulfilment happen in a similar catastrophe which occurred at the same place; and the *cry heard in Ramah* was the lamentation round about Jerusalem.

211. *What has God established as a general law in the creation?*

That every thing which hath life must die, as sin hath brought death into the world; that summer and winter shall not fail; that self-preservation is the first law of nature; that for every evil there is a counterbalance, or a mitigation; that man should be born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upwards; that sin brings its own punishment along with it; that every thing contains within itself the seeds of decay.

212. *What is the precise meaning of justification by faith, faith only, and good works.*

Justification is a forensic term, and signifies being accounted righteous before God, in whose sight no man living could be

justified on the score of his own merits; and who therefore, in love, sent his Son into the world, Jesus Christ the righteous, through whose merits we are justified.

Faith is the hand which lays hold on justification, and is necessary to every man who would apply that gift to his own particular case; and without this faith it is impossible to please God, Heb. xi. 6.

Justification by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and full of comfort, intended to exclude any works of ours from even a participation in meriting our salvation (Art. xi.); since such a notion would lead to self-righteousness, or often (when we calmly and seriously view the selfish and mixed motives which produced our best works, and their blotted and imperfect nature) into a despair of contributing even our share towards that great work, which is accomplished by Christ alone, — the opening of the kingdom of heaven to all believers.

But though any *merit* in good works is excluded, the faith which embraces justification must be, not the faith of devils, who believe and tremble, but a living faith, from which holy works follow as the fruits from a tree; otherwise it is a spurious faith.

It must be a faith which worketh or evidenceth itself by love — love to God, who so loved us, and love to man, as the children of God; for *if a man love not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen?* Faith comes and clings to Christ, not only as the great sacrifice or self-immolated Priest, but as the King, whose will is to be obeyed; as the Prophet or Teacher, whose lessons are to be followed; as the Exemplar of going about doing good; as the Judge, who will call us to account, whether we have rightly embraced his salvation, or whether we have believed in vain.

213. *The proper effect and design of a miracle.*

*To shew that the power of the agent is derived from God, and, consequently, that his declarations are true; since God would not communicate that power to him for the support of a falsehood.

214. *Translate into Latin Matt. xvi. 14-17. Was there any prophecy in the Old Testament relating to the circumstances here detailed? Quote the passage.*

Illi vero dixerunt, Hi quidem Ioannem Baptistam: alii autem, Eliam: alii vero, Hieremiam, vel unum ex prophetis. Dicit illis, Vos autem, quem me dicitis esse? Respondens autem Simon Petrus dixit, Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi. Et respondens Jesus dixit ei, Beatus es, Simon Bar-jona, quia caro et sanguis non revelavit hoc tibi, sed Pater meus, qui est in cœlis.

The prophecy immediately alluded to was that of Malachi iv. 5, *Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.* See also Matt. iii. 1. The ancient Jews believed that Elias should come in person, to restore all things, Mark ix. 12, John i. 21 (as is fully set forth in Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 10); and the Jews to this day pray for his coming, as a precursor of their Messias. John the Baptist denied himself to be Elias in this literal sense (John i. 21); but our Saviour unveils the mystical sense (Matt. xi. 14, xvii. 12, 13), as the Baptist came in the spirit and power of Elias (Luke i. 17), like him reproving and exhorting to repentance: just as our Lord himself is called David (Hos. iii. 5), because many things may be alike predicated concerning both.

Another prophecy relating to a forerunner of the Messiah, but not specifying the person, was that of Isaiah xl. 3, *The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God*—a figure taken from pioneers clearing the way for the march of a conqueror.

But before the time of our Saviour the doctrine of metempsychosis had crept, from the schools of Alexandria, into the creed of the Jews, as appears from Herod's remorse, *This is John, whom I beheaded—he is risen from the dead.* Again, hesitating between the second commandment and the doctrine taught by Ezekiel, *the son shall not die for the iniquity of his father*, while they thought that the misfortunes of one state of being were lustrations of some sin in another, the disciples asked

our Saviour, *Did this man sin* (in a former state of being), *or his parents, that he was born blind?*

These remarks may account for the conjectures, that our Saviour was Jeremiah or one of the old prophets restored : and Peter is pronounced *blessed* in acknowledging our Lord not to be a forerunner or any inferior prophet, but the Son of God himself, the Lord who should suddenly come to his own temple.

215. *The harmony and intimate connexion subsisting between all parts of Scripture prove its authenticity and divine original.*

A design to impose on the world is usually undertaken by contemporaries, in league and communication with each other ; or if it descends from one generation to another, it is only so long as the illusion or the advantage to be gained by the imposture continues the same. Even could we conceive it to be perpetuated, the change of times and manners in the dispositions and views of successive races would, in course of time, destroy the consistency of the plan and the coherence of its several parts. Reformers and ambitious men would arise, sweeping away or setting aside the views of their predecessors, and setting up for themselves.

But where, save in one instance, was there ever a plan, laid at the creation, and carried on by all its promoters throughout three thousand or four thousand years, though with different personal talents and modes of expression, yet with an entire unity of design, from which no one of them ever swerved ? These men—the sacred writers—could have had no collusion, no common point of worldly gain to pursue ; yet they succeed one another at long intervals, as builders upon the same plan, and as placing a common confidence in the almighty original Architect. They all prophesy respecting the same individual to come ; they keep consistently in one story ; they establish or support a system of types and sacrifices, *emblematic* prophecies of that individual's great work. Abraham is called 1921 years B.C., Moses 1491 B.C., with all the other prophets intervening or succeeding (like stars rising one after another in the horizon) ; yet these men, separated by hundreds and thousands of years, labour at the same

design. Nor must we omit the progression with which the intelligence opens—from the indefinite announcement of one, who should be the seed of the woman, and the gradual development of his race, his tribe, his family, his birth-place, his actions, down to a declaration of the very time when he should suffer for sin; always increasing in distinctness and in interest as the fulfilment drew nearer, till the person could not be mistaken: like a dawn spread on the mountains, gradually illuminating the world, till the Sun of righteousness arose with healing upon his wings.

And all this in the Old Testament finds its exact counterpart in the New. To every particular there is a tally; to every receding angle there is a salient one. Every thing in the Law is echoed in the Gospel. Whatever is faint is made clear; whatever is mysterious is explained, so far as human capacity can comprehend it; whatever is prophesied is performed; types are realised; and Christ, the Alpha and Omega, united in his person the Seed of the woman—the Shiloh of Jacob's dying words—the Son of David—the virgin's Son of Isaiah—the despised and rejected Man of Jeremiah—the Messiah of Daniel—the King of Zechariah—the Glory of the latter house—and the Lamb who taketh away the sins of the world.

The prophecies and Psalms are illustrations of the Old Testament narrative, as the Epistles are of the Gospels and Acts. The character of the Saviour—the objects of his mission—the heart-searching demands of his religion—the universal diffusion of the truth throughout the world, are never lost sight of; and the superhuman, yet sustained and harmonious, features of that original portrait, dignified and meek, God and man, are traced throughout the various styles of men unused to composition, and too simple to deceive. Surely this plan is of Divine original; *truly this is the Son of God.*

216. *Inspiration not only reasonable, but necessary.*

Reason or natural religion carry man but a little way in the knowledge of his Creator, his duties, and his destinies; they lead but to clouded hopes and unproved conjectures. But, in a

matter so important, it might be expected that God would afford some more satisfactory information, particularly on points which the unaided faculties could not discover; and, accordingly, certain individuals hold themselves out as the channels through which this information is supplied, and write a book, called the Bible, containing the required intelligence, as the revealed will and word of God.

Now, it is not only reasonable, but necessary for our certain conviction, that these men should derive their knowledge of the truths communicated immediately from God himself; otherwise, however learned or wise, they would impart the conclusions of their own judgment, which would still leave us in the darkness of natural religion, and would be guess-work — not assurance. What could we know, without direct communication from God to our *original* teachers (which is inspiration), concerning redemption and sanctification? the most important matters in the world for fallen, sinful, frail man to know. It is, therefore, in the nature of the thing, reasonable and necessary, that the holy men of old time who have composed the books of the Bible should have written, not of their own mind, but as the Spirit gave them utterance; that *all* Scripture should be given by the inspiration of God.

217. *What were the ὑπηρέται, βασανισταί, and the πράκτορες, and what their duties?*

They were officers who executed the sentence of a magistrate; ὑπηρέτης, Matt. v. 25; βασανιστής, Matt. xviii. 34; πράκτωρ, Luke xii. 58. The ὑπηρέτης was an under-officer, an attendant generally (Matt. xxvi. 58, 1 Cor. iv. 1), whether religious or civil. The πράκτωρ was the bailiff, who exacted a debt or mulct, and in default of payment cast the debtor into prison. The βασανιστής was the jailor, who tormented to extort confession; or the disciplinarian in the house of correction, who inflicted the suitable measure of punishment.

218. *Do you suppose, and on what ground, that our Lord composed the prayer called by his name, or compiled it from Jewish euchologists?*

St. Luke states, that our Lord delivered this prayer at the request of one of his disciples that he would teach them a *form* of prayer, in imitation of John's instruction to his own disciples. In answer, he compiles a short but comprehensive prayer from the nineteen (originally eighteen) prayers of the Jewish liturgy, in which, according to Lightfoot, the substance of the whole—except the clause *as we forgive our debtors*—is contained. The doxology is considered as interpolated from these ancient liturgies, as it is wanting in several manuscripts and versions.

This account is taken from Bloomfield's notes on Matt. vi. 9; but, on referring to Horne, vol. iii. p. 268, where שְׁמוֹנֶה עָשָׂר, or the *eighteen*, i. e. prayers, are given, I am not able to discover the sources of the compilation. There is, "Our Father;" and "thy name is holy;" and "thou art our King;" and "let the kingdom of pride be speedily rooted out" (in the uncharitable nineteenth, now the twelfth, which seems to apply the expression to Christianity); and "bless us in every work of our hands;" and "pardon us, for we have transgressed;" and abundance of matter for the doxology: but all this is too common and scattered to warrant the opinion of a systematic compilation. Such is the evil of quoting documents from report or at second-hand, when the quoter has not consulted them. In fact, there is internal evidence in this *Shemoneh Esreh*, שְׁמוֹנֶה עָשָׂר, to shew it to be a composition of much later date, and some of it even subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem. The loose and general assertion of Lightfoot (vol. ii. p. 1003), however, may be correct, viz. that "the whole of the Lord's prayer might be almost picked out of the Jewish liturgies;" for the modern Jews deny not the words, though they disallow their full force. Yet, after all, "our Father which art in heaven," "thy kingdom come" (in a worldly sense), and "lead us not into temptation," from the *Rosh Hashava*, are the only passages discoverable in Lightfoot. Allen's *Modern Judaism*, p. 340.

219. *Translate from the Greek 1 Cor. iv. 9, and particularly explain the word ἐπιθανάριος.*

"For I think that God hath exhibited us, the apostles of the lower condition (or, in the end of the day), as appointed to death, so that we should become a theatre to the universe, both men and angels."

Ἐπιθανάριος alludes to persons of the lowest class, who, after contending in the theatre or amphitheatre in the beginning of the day, with gladiators or wild beasts, with a faint hope of life through conquest, and being allowed defensive armour, were brought forth in the after-part of the show to certain destruction, by combating defenceless with each other, when the savage populace could no more exercise the privilege *vertere pollicem*, the survivors being only reserved for slaughter on another day. The ἔσχατοι were those last brought out to this butchery.

The spectators, "men and angels," shew that we are under the eye of invisible as well as visible witnesses—a cloud of the former always encompassing us, even when the latter are absent.

220. *First Epistle of St. John.*

The first Epistle of John is not addressed to any church or disciple, and has more the air of a treatise than of an epistle. Divines have differed respecting its date; Benson, Hale, and Tomline, placing it before the destruction of Jerusalem, in 68 or 69, chiefly relying on the words, *It is the last hour*, ch. ii. 18; but Lardner, Mill, Leclerc, and others, from about A.D. 80 to A.D. 100. The opening words seem to indicate the correctness of the latter opinion, as they are particularly aimed at the Δοκεταί, who laid a particular stress on an error more or less common to all the Gnostics,—that Christ only suffered in appearance; for usually a *general* heresy arises first, and, in time, the heretics split among themselves, each insisting upon his particular views. To whom but the Doceti could John allude in saying, "That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked continually upon, which our hands have handled of the word of life, declare we,"

&c.? These words intimate, first, that the apostles had *heard* our risen Lord's address, *Go ye unto all nations*, &c. Matt. xxviii. 28; secondly, had *seen* him eat and drink after his resurrection, Luke xxiv. 42; and, thirdly, had *felt* the spear and nail wounds, Luke xxiv. 39; that is, that their sight had confirmed the testimony of their hearing, and their touch that of their sight.

The allusions in this Epistle to light and darkness, to the identity of Jesus and Christ, and to the power of God over the evil principle,—all shew that the Gnostic heresy had then made considerable way in the church. The expression *little children*, used instead of "brethren," intimates the language of a man in old age with reference to his disciples, and the authority of a survivor of all the other apostles.

221. *The rapid progress of the Gospel proved from the book of Acts.*

The Jews assembled at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, after our Lord's ascension, had resorted thither from every part of Asia, Africa, and Europe, Acts ii. 9-11; even from Parthia, Cyrene, and Rome, countries which reached the limits of the then known world; and indeed, there were gathered together men of every nation under heaven. These, returning to their several homes, would prepare their countrymen for the regular preaching of the Gospel. This preparatory knowledge would be increased, after the martyrdom of Stephen, by the persecution, which scattered abroad the disciples throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, Acts viii. 1. The next great incident was the conversion of St. Paul, with his labours in settling and confirming the churches in Asia Minor, Greece, Rome, and probably as far as Spain, or, as some think, even Britain; Rom. xv. 24-28, x. 18, Colos. i. 23; Bishop Burgess *on the Preaching of St. Paul*; Hale *on the British Churches*.

We know that there were Christians, though yet imperfectly instructed, prior to the arrival of Paul in Rome; for they came forth to meet him as far as Appii Forum and the Three Taverns. And in the question which arose respecting the observance of

the legal ordinances after conversion to Christianity, the determination, enjoining a few restrictions on Christian liberty, hinged on the expedience of not offending, or rather of gaining over, the dispersed Jews. *For Moses of old time hath in EVERY CITY them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day*, Acts xv. 21. *So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed*, Acts xix. 20. From one hundred and twenty, in one day the disciples became three thousand souls, Acts i. 15, ii. 41; and soon became so formidable and respectable in numbers as to acquire the distinctive name of "Christians," Acts xi. 26.

222. *Genuineness and authenticity of Scripture.*

A genuine book is that which is written by the author whose name it bears: an authentic book is that of which the contents are true. All the books of the Bible are authentic; but not so the apocryphal books; though some of them, as the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, may be genuine. The Pentateuch is both genuine and authentic, excepting only a few words giving an account of the death of Moses, &c., which, of course, are authentic, but not genuine. It is no impeachment of the genuineness of a book, that the author mentions himself in the third person; this being the style of Xenophon and Cæsar as well as of Moses and St. Matthew. The Pentateuch was always and universally ascribed to Moses, even by the ten tribes, who possessed a copy of it in the Samaritan characters: and as to its authenticity, its facts tally with ancient history; and the prophecies contained in it, which have been fulfilled, or are now under fulfilment, are vouchers for the truth of the whole narrative. The same remark applies to the later prophecies as supporting the historical facts. The language, which underwent various changes with the fates of the people, fixes the period when those books were written. In purity and in general structure it perceptibly varies in the times of Moses, Solomon, and Ezra. The Samaritan Pentateuch is a comment on the division of the kingdoms. The improved form of the letters, and the Hebrew-Chaldean dialect, with several chapters of pure Chaldee in Daniel and Ezra, and a verse of Jeremiah (x. 11),

afford a memorial of the Babylonish captivity. The mixture of Syriac and Hellenistic Greek in the New Testament are what we should expect to be spoken by borderers and a conquered race; while the Hebrew idioms are those of Jews writing in a language not vernacular. The coins also pronounce the same comment. The drams of Ezra (ii. 69) and Nehemiah (vii. 71, 72) are the Persian darics (the דַרִיכָא), and indicate the return under Cyrus. The shekel was a weight till the time of Simon Maccabeus, and then, to confirm the allegiance of the ten tribes, and to find currency in Tyre and Sidon, they bore the Samaritan or Phœnician characters; 1 Maccab. xv. 6. In the New Testament, the Greek money, the stater and other coins, were found in Galilee, near the range of Syrian commerce, where also the language was purer Syriac, and spoken by our Lord (Mark vii. 34, v. 41, Matt. xxvii. 46) and his apostles, Mark xiv. 70; but the denarius in Jerusalem, where the Roman soldiers were paid in money having the image and superscription of Cæsar. The fish containing the first was taken at Capernaum, Matt. xvii. 27: the last was current in the neighbourhood of the Temple (Matt. xxii. 19), a mark and memorial of subjection amongst the rebellious Jews. In the same manner, the mode of sitting at meat, the *triclinium* (John ii. 9), and the new computation of hours by John, shew a state of society in which the Jewish were giving way to the Romish customs. The genuineness of the books of the New Testament was never disputed; and their authenticity is supported by the failure of enemies to disprove it—by contemporary history—by the early Fathers—by enemies acknowledging the miracles—by the deaths of martyrs—by the flourishing state of the Gospel, its progression and permanence—by its accommodating itself to all ages, countries, governments, improvements, and states of society—by its triumphing over every varied and virulent assault of infidelity—and by the uninterrupted preservation and multiplication of copies of the sacred books down to the present day.

223. *Describe the first and second Temples.*

The first Temple, built by Solomon after the model of the tabernacle, was a magnificent building, having two courts—the

outer, that of the Israelites; and the inner, that of the priests. In the outer court stood the treasury, consisting of long chests, broad at the bottom and narrow at the top, that they might not be robbed, and that worshippers might unostentatiously drop their alms unobserved, so that their left hand might not know what their right hand did, Matt. vi. 3.

On a low parapet, which separated this court from that of the priests (which no lay-Jews could enter), the people laid their offerings, to be presented by the priests on the neighbouring altar of burnt-offering; and hence our Saviour's injunction, *Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift*, Matt. v. 24, 25. The court of the priests contained the altar of burnt-offering, on which the morning and evening sacrifice were consumed, the victims being bound to the horns of the altar, Ps. cxviii. 27; and the brazen laver or sea, in which the priests purified themselves, by an emblematic effusion, before entering on the services of the sanctuary. The sanctuary, or Temple properly so called, had an outer and an inner division or chamber. The former contained the seven-branched candelabrum, the table of shewbread, and the altar of incense. Hither the priests, in the order of their twenty-four courses, entered daily to trim the lamps, to wave the censer of incense before the Lord, and, on the eve of the Sabbath, to change the twelve loaves of shewbread; and here Zacharias was when he was struck dumb, and the people were praying without (Luke i. 8, 1 Chron. xxiv.), that is, in the court of the Israelites.

The inner chamber or apartment, called the *holy of holies* (a Hebrew idiom for the superlative degree), was separated by a rich veil or curtain from this former chamber, or the holy place. It contained the ark of the covenant, surmounted by the mercy-seat, which was formed by the inverted wings of two cherubim, on which sat the shechinah, or symbol of the divine presence. Hence God was called by David, *He that sitteth between the cherubim*, Ps. lxxx. 1; see also Ezekiel, x. 2; and such had been his state in the tabernacle, Exod. xxv. 22, 1 Sam. iv. 4.

Within the ark were the two stone tables on which the decalogue was written by the finger of God, the rod of Aaron that budded, and the memorial pot of manna. Into this sacred recess the high-priest alone entered, only one day in the year, the great day of expiation, in the month Tisri (our September), to make atonement for the sins of himself and the people, by sprinkling the blood of the victims on the ark of the covenant; which, as the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin, was an act typical of the great and only sacrifice.

It is in allusion to these cherubim poring over the tables of the law, while shielding themselves with their wings from the glory of the Gospel and the Divine presence, that St. Peter writes (1 Pet. i. 12), *Into which things the angels desire to look*, *κατακύβηαι*, *to stoop down*; the same word used in Luke xxiv. 12 and John xx. 5 for the stooping down of Peter and John into the sepulchre: which disproves the *rationalist* figures of unmeaning *animals standing* with extended wings, as exhibited in the plates to the *History of the Jews*, and other engravings, only tending to diminish our salutary awe in contemplating the work of atonement and the presence of a personal God, which inspire the humility, and incite the study of the highest spiritual intelligences.

The separating veil was rent at the moment of our Lord's death upon the cross, to shew that the law of ordinances was brought to an end, since men had thenceforward a new and living way within the veil, the blood of the great Victim, prefigured by all other sacrifices; an entrance ministered abundantly both to Jews and Gentiles, since all had thenceforward equal access to the place of mercy. The handwriting was cancelled, and the ritual nailed to the cross, Col. ii. 14. From the mercy-seat (called also the oracle) the high-priest had, in the old Temple, brought responses to the people, on his breast-plate of precious stones, called the Urim and Thummim.

The second Temple, or that of Zerubbabel (afterwards repaired by Herod), resembled the first in its ground-plan and most of its furniture, but it was much less magnificent, by reason of the poverty of the newly-returned exiles from Babylon; which occasioned the old men who had seen the first in its glory to

shed tears, partly of joy that their worship was restored, and partly of grief for its diminished splendour; but the builders were cheered on by Haggai and Zechariah, who foretold that *the glory of that latter house should be greater than the former*, Hag. ii. 9; and that Christ should be *a fountain for sin and uncleanness*; that *he should be wounded in his hands, in the house of his friends*, Zech. xiii. 1 and 6; and also, that *many nations and strong should come to seek the Lord in Jerusalem*, viii. 22.

The second Temple wanted five things which had belonged to that of Solomon, 1st. the ark of the covenant and mercy-seat; 2d. the shechinah, or divine presence; 3d. the Urim and Thummim, or oracular responses from the high-priest's breast-plate; 4th. the holy fire, which descended from heaven upon the altar; and, 5th. the spirit of prophecy, which at that time was sealed and closed. But the coming of Jesus (the true glory) to that temple, 1st. at his presentation; 2d. when he disputed with the doctors; and, 3d. when he drove out the buyers and sellers, accomplished the predictions of Haggai and Zechariah; and likewise that of Malachi (iii. 1), *the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple*.

Another court, that of the Gentiles, was added to the two courts of the first Temple in the Temple of Zerubbabel and Herod. This was intended for those proselytes of the gate who acknowledged the one God, but did not submit to the law of ordinances. It was revered and protected as holy, and as part of the universal Father's house, for it was from this court that our Saviour drove the traffickers; and here he performed some miraculous cures. It was separated from the court of the Israelites by a space called *חֵל*, *chel*, ten cubits wide, and a low outer wall, the *soreg*, called the middle wall of partition. Hence Christ was said, by his death, to have been *our peace, who hath made both*—i. e. Jews and Gentiles—*one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us: having abolished in his flesh the enmity, or law of commandments in ordinances*; an allusion to the spiritual demolition of the *chel*, or wall separating the court of the Gentiles from that of the Israelites, and beyond which for a Gentile to pass inwards had been death; Ephes. ii. 14. The passage from this outer to the inner court, viz. that

of the Israelites, lay through a magnificent gate of Corinthian brass, called *beautiful*, where the poor and lame were placed, that they might ask alms, both of Jews and Gentiles—charity being of all religions; and at the threshold of the Jewish women's court—charity being conspicuous in that sex.

224. *What proofs are there that the books of the Old and New Testament have been transmitted to us entire and uncorrupted?*

The canonical books of the *Old Testament* are mentioned and numbered by Josephus, and tally with those of our own Bible. The Septuagint likewise gives the same list, and in the same words and order: and the Samaritan and Hebrew versions of the *Pentateuch* closely agree. The care taken in transcribing the Old Testament was extremely minute: every king, it is said, copied the law, and a single error vitiated the whole. The minute attention to correctness is seen in our Saviour's declaration, *One jot or one tittle* (probably a י and a י,) *of the law should not fail, &c.* Our Saviour and his apostles quote the Septuagint, shewing the books to be the same as those now received; and so do Philo and Josephus. If there had been any mutilation of the Hebrew Scriptures, those facts would have been expunged which tarnished the national honour. But such alteration could not have happened soon after the death of Moses, for the facts were then too well remembered; and, at any future period, it would have been detected and reproved by the prophets; while the rival kingdoms of Israel and Judah were guards against the interference of either with the text. Had any alteration been attempted after the time of Christ, it would have been that of expunging the prophecies respecting him which could not be gainsayed. The genealogies, and the laws respecting inheritance, were blended with the other sacred writings, and could not have been tampered with without prompt remonstrance—nay, they gave protection to all the other parts of Scripture in which they were inlaid. After the captivity, Ezra read the law to all the people; and Moses was read in all synagogues, together with the prophets and hagiographa. 1150 MSS. of the Old Testament, yet extant, all agree, with the exception of a .

few minute diversities incidental to transcription, and of no importance.

As to the *New Testament*, no sooner were the books composing it published, than copies were multiplied, dispersed, and preserved with the greatest care. Translations were made soon after, and those versions still remain; and the quotations of the earliest Fathers (so many, that the whole of the Gospels and Epistles might be compiled from them) correspond with our present reading. Even in the apostolic age various heresies arose; and these would be prone to corrupt the text, if it were possible, in their own copies, but would be, and in fact always were, in such attempts at interpolation, erasure, and alteration, checked by the orthodox believers, and by the jealousy of rival sects, who would immediately bring back the sacred writings to their pure and original standard. Some literal errors, indeed, have been caused by the negligence or ignorance of transcribers, and some attempts were for a time successful to introduce a few corruptions; but when divines came to collate the various manuscripts and versions, these were detected, and the right standard restored. The variations, however, were, after all, so trifling as not to affect any important doctrine. By comparing the multitude of extant copies of the ancient Scriptures, criticism can now ascertain which reading is the true one, and there is hardly a really disputed passage left. Griesbach collated three hundred and fifty ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, as Kennicott had examined six hundred of the Old; and it has been truly observed, that the worst manuscript extant would not pervert one article of faith, or destroy one moral precept. In short, the New Testament could not be corrupted in the time of the apostles, as the facts were yet fresh; nor afterwards, since the copies were so numerous, in order to be read in all Christian assemblies and churches, as to render an attempt at alteration impossible without immediate detection.

225. The procuring cause or principle of man's redemption.

Originally, the love of God, who sent his Son: immediately, the voluntary sacrifice of Christ. *Being justified freely by his*

GRACE, *through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*, Rom. iii. 24. *In whom (Christ) we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace*, Ephes. i. 7, Colos. i. 14.

226. *Prove the unity of the holy Catholic Church.*

The holy Catholic Church may be composed of an unlimited number of individual churches, provided they have, with minor differences, a common principle of faith and worship. It is this principle which constitutes its unity and bond of peace; and the only question respects the extension or limitation of the principle. St. Paul sends *grace and peace to all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours*, 1 Cor. i. 2. This would extend the principle of unity to the belief in Christ as a Saviour, and worship of him as divine. The church is a building, reared on the *foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone: in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom also ye are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit*, Ephes. ii. 20-22. Again, Christ is a vine, and believers in him are the branches: and here again he is the principle of unity; for except the branch abide in the vine, it hath no life in it; and every branch abiding in the vine beareth fruit, and is pruned and dressed, that it may bring forth more fruit, John xv. 1-9. But though this principle of a common confession of faith might suffice for all the benefits of an union under Christ, some stricter limitation seems necessary to accomplish his great object—a harmony of love among his disciples; *that they all may be one, holy Father, as we are*, John xvii. 11. An unity of feeling in other points is requisite to the complete establishment of love and cordial co-operation in the Church; and the grand bond of this unity, both as to order and internal harmony, is Episcopacy. Christ is the body, and his disciples are the members; *from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth* (the Holy Spirit, which, like a circulating fluid, diffuses itself through all the members), *according to the effectual work-*

ing in the measure of every part, maketh increase of itself unto the edifying of itself in love, Ephes. iv. 16.

Holding Christ as a head, then, constitutes, 1st, an unity of *origination*, for the first church was built on the same rock, which was Christ; 2dly, a unity of *faith*, for the first church had one faith; 3dly, an *unity in sacraments*, for the primitive church had one baptism, and continued in breaking of bread; 4thly, an unity of *charity*, for the union of the first Christians produced a common edification in *love*; and, lastly, an *unity of government and discipline*, still following the first church, whose members received baptism from the apostles as appointed ministers, and the other sacrament originally, from Christ himself, as sent and commissioned by the Father — by him who constituted him a great High-priest. Now, he himself said to his apostles, *As the Father hath sent me, so send I you; and so saying he breathed on them, and they received the Holy Ghost*, John ii. 21, 22; and that this sending forth, or commissioning to administer the sacraments, was described by the apostles as being ordained to be transmitted by imposition of hands, and by superiors to inferiors in order, from generation to generation, is evident from St. Paul's advice to Timothy bishop of Ephesus, *Lay hands suddenly on no man*, 1 Tim. v. 2.

Neither may any man assume this power but they to whom it is regularly given, by their being *called of God, as was Aaron*, Heb. v. 4; and the duty even of the disciples while Christ lived was (not to ordain others to the ministry, but) to *pray God that he would send labourers into his harvest*, Luke x. 2. And though a man is to pronounce his belief that he is moved to seek the ministry by the Spirit of God, of which the laying on of hands is the authorised emblem, yet it belongs to *others* to judge of this by less fallible tests — to *try the spirits, whether they be of God*, 1 John iv. 1. Thus, a man by being ordained does not obtain the power of ordaining others; which, with the government of the church, is placed in a higher order of ministers; and this is the *principle of episcopacy*.

227. *In what do Christianity and Mahomedanism resemble each other? and what difference is there which prevents all reasoning from one case to the other?*

They both profess the unity of God, and acknowledge the facts of the Old Testament. Mahomet allows Christ likewise as a prophet, but without acknowledging his Divinity; while he puts forth himself as another and a higher prophet. Mahomet mistook the promise of another Paraclete, as not fulfilled at the day of Pentecost, but as leaving a vacant chair for himself to occupy. In this respect he resembled Joanna Southcote, who, at the age of sixty-five, imagined the other Paraclete, or Shiloh, to be in her womb.

Mahomet artfully changed the prophecy *Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee* (Ps. ii. 7), into "Thou art my prophet: this day have I educated thee." *In Isaac shall thy seed be called*, was, however, understood by the Jews of the Messiah; and this excluded Ishmael.

228. *At what period of our Lord's ministry did the imprisonment of John the Baptist take place?*

John having remonstrated boldly against Herod Antipas for marrying his brother Philip's wife, was cast by him into the castle or fortress of Machærus on the Dead Sea, A.D. 30, and beheaded A.D. 32; so that his imprisonment happened in the first year of our Lord's public ministry, or between the first and second passover.

229. *Explain the idiom, a Hebrew of the Hebrews.*

A "Hebrew of the Hebrews" is a superlative according to the Hebrew idiom; the "holy of holies" is the holiest place; the "heaven of heavens," the highest heavens; a "servant of servants," the lowest slave; and a "Hebrew of the Hebrews," a Hebrew in the highest sense, by nation, by birth, by language, by the strictest observance of the law. Huntingdon, who was an Antinomian of the Antinomians, called his parish-minister an Arminian of the Arminians.

230. *How was the tribe of Levi divided, what were the names of the divisions, and what were their duties in the times of Moses, David, and Solomon?*

Into three families, called, after their heads, the Kohathites, the Gershonites, and the Merarites. The priesthood was fixed in the house of Aaron, part of the family of Kohath.

The *Gershonites*, in the days of *Moses*, pitched their tents in the wilderness, behind the tabernacle westward; and had the charge of the whole tabernacle, the tent, the covering thereof, the hanging for the door of the tabernacle, and the hangings of the court, and the curtain for the door of the court, and the cords for its service; Num. iii. 25, 26.

The *Kohathites* pitched their tent on the south side of the tabernacle; and had the charge of the ark of the covenant, the table of shewbread, the golden candlestick, the two altars of incense and burnt-offering, with the different vessels and hangings of the sanctuary.

The *Merarites* encamped on the north side of the sanctuary, having charge of the boards, the bars, the pillars, and the sockets of the tabernacle, with the vessels for its service, and the pillars of the surrounding court, with their pins, sockets, and cords.

When the camp set forward, the *priests* took down the vail before the holy of holies, and threw it over the ark of the covenant, together with all the outward coverings of skins. They were likewise to cover, in the same reverential manner, the candlestick, the altar of incense, and all the vessels of the sanctuary, and also the altar of burnt-offering. It was then the province of the sons of Kohath to bear these things so covered, neither seeing them nor touching them.

The Gershonites preceded, bearing those parts of the furniture which were given to them in charge, and the Merarites with theirs: and they pitched the tabernacle, and made every thing ready, at the place where the descending shechinah appointed a halt, for the sanctuary to be placed under the cloudy pillar when the Kohathites should arrive.

After the arrival in Canaan, the Levites, in their several families, were distributed among the Levitical cities, which,

with their suburbs, were to be to them in lieu of an appointment of land. Four cities in each tribe were allotted to them—forty-eight in all—in which they might teach religion to the people, act as domestic ministers, and sit with the elders as judges at the gate of the city. A preference was given in this allotment to the Kohathites of the house of Aaron the priest, who had thirteen cities out of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin, for the more convenient access to Jerusalem, when they went up to minister in the order of the twenty-four courses. The remainder of the Kohathites had ten cities out of Ephraim, Dan, and half-Manasseh west.

When the cloud rose from the Tabernacle, the army moved, saying, *Arise, O God, and let thine enemies be scattered.* When the cloud stopped, they halted, exclaiming, *Return, O Lord, to the many thousands of Israel,* Num. x. 35, 36, Wisdom xviii. 3.

The Gershonites had two cities in East Manasseh, four in Issachar, four in Asher, and three in Naphtali—in all thirteen. The Merarites had four cities in Zebulun, four in Reuben, four in Gad—in all twelve. Besides these Levitical cities and their suburbs, these families held a tithe of all the produce of the land, that they might not be distracted with the worldly cares incidental to agricultural possessions; and this tithe was their freehold, as much as the general territory was that of the other tribes.

In the time of *David*, the Levites carried back the ark from the land of the Philistines; but David appointed a portion of them to be singers, with all instruments of music, before the recovered ark; and the king himself took a harp and played, in testimony of joy, among these minstrels. On this occasion the twenty-fourth psalm was composed; and the ark carried up to Zion was a type of the ascension of our Lord. *Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and the King of glory shall come in,* Psalm xxiv. 7. David, in his old age, appointed *Solomon* his son to be king; and as God had given rest unto his people, so that they might dwell in Jerusalem permanently, that monarch, in preparation for the building of his Temple, ordered that the Levites should no more carry the tabernacle nor its vessels, but that all

those of twenty years old and upwards should wait on the priests in the house of the Lord, in the courts and chambers, in purifying all holy vessels, and preparing the shewbread and the sacrifices. These offices, as well as those of musicians, porters, and treasurers of the Temple, were assigned to the Levites by lot.

Of 38,000 Levites, 24,000 were appointed to set forward the work of the Lord's house, 6000 were officers and judges, 4000 porters, 4000 singers,—all divided into twenty-four courses; so that each course officiated a fortnight in the year, and then returned to their common occupations in the Levitical cities.

The musical Levites were present at the dedication of Solomon's Temple; and at the east end of the altar, just within the court of the priests, celebrated the descent of the glory of the Lord with loud songs and instruments of music. The Levites carried arms in time of war.

231. Tithes given to the Deity obtained before the time of Moses.

Abraham, returning from his expedition against Chedorlaomer and the other confederates, paid tithe of the spoil to Melchizedek, king of Salem and priest of the most high God, Gen. xiv. 20, Heb. vii. 4; and his grandson Jacob, on setting up his pillar at Bethel, vowed, *This stone shall be God's house; and of all that thou shalt give me (in Mesopotamia), surely I will give the tenth unto thee*, Gen. xxviii. 22.

232. Sabbatical year, and the year of jubilee.

As the seventh day under the law was a day of rest for man and beast, so the seventh year was a rest for the land, which was then permitted to be fallow, or remain uncultivated. Whatever was produced without tillage or pruning was left common for all, especially for the poor and the cattle; Exod. xxiii. 11, Levit. xxv. 1-22.

The Jews, however, were not idle in this year, but could fish, pursue wild beasts, repair their houses and furniture, and carry on their manufactures and commerce,—only devoting a more

than ordinary portion of time to religious exercises. At this time the whole law was appointed to be read, Deut. xxxi. 10-13. And as God had, in the wilderness, given a double portion of manna on the day preceding the Sabbath, so now he promised a year of universal fertility on the season preceding the Sabbatical year. This exercised the faith of the Jews, and kept up the sense of a particular Providence, of dependence on God, and charity towards the poor. A neglect of this law is mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, as numbered with the sins which caused the captivity; and the length of which, seventy years, is stated as compensating the land for the Sabbatical years of which it had been defrauded.

After the captivity, the Sabbatical years were more faithfully observed; and Josephus relates, that exemption from tribute in those years was granted by Alexander, and afterwards by a Roman emperor.

The Sabbatical year was called the year of release, as debts were then remitted or not collected, and Hebrew servants recovered their personal liberty, unless they wished to remain with their masters; but they were not sent away without some provision from the soil they had cultivated; Exod. xxi. 23, Levit. xxv., Deut. xv. The commencement of the Sabbatical year was announced on the great day of atonement of the sixth year; and the reading of the law from a pulpit marked its conclusion, during the feast of tabernacles, with a liturgy of seven prayers; Deut. i. 6, iv. 11, xi. 13, xxix. 2.

The year of jubilee, like the Sabbatical year, commenced on the day of expiation, every forty-ninth year, after a Sabbath of Sabbaths, or seven Sabbatical years. The fiftieth year was then celebrated with joy; and as the forty-ninth year would be the ordinary Sabbatical year, two successive years of rest would distinguish the time of the jubilee, in which the people would trust to divine Providence for support; Levit. xxv. 20-22. This custom is referred to in 2 Kings xix. 29.

In the year of jubilee, from יִבְּל, *a trumpet*, or *ram's horn*, all lands or houses in the country reverted to their owners; and this extended even to royal grants (Ezek. xlv. 16-18), which

then returned to the crown; while all poorer Israelites, who, though not slaves, had engaged themselves as servants, returned to the possession of their paternal inheritance. This regulation tended to check extravagant wealth, to preclude hopeless misery, and to preserve that middle state of general competence in which happiness is found; and yet, as the poor should never cease from the land, it nourished the feelings of charity. Luke iv. 18, 19, seems to indicate our Saviour to have been born in a jubilee year; but it is, more probably, an expression of the spiritual sense of Isaiah lxi. 1.

Thus there was an ordinary Sabbath in the Mosaic law, a Sabbath of weeks in the feast of pentecost, a Sabbath of years in the Sabbatical years, and a Sabbath of Sabbaths in the jubilee. As the jubilee was an extra year after the completed Sabbath of years, may it not have been a type of the resurrection of our Lord on the morning after the Sabbath, and a warrant for the rest of the Christian Sunday? See Question 140.

233. *Describe a Jewish house.*

A Jewish house bore some resemblance to the quadrangle in a college. It was entered, however, by a porch, with benches on each side, whereon the owner sat, and transacted business with strangers, or received his visitors; *happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them*, i.e. children; *they shall not be ashamed when they speak with their enemies in the gate*, Ps. cxxvii. 5. The door of the porch, and a projecting balcony or kiosk over it, alone looked into the street. Here Daniel performed his devotions three times a-day, according to Jewish rites, Dan. vi. 19. The court or area was open to the air; and in this place the guests assembled for an entertainment, having an awning drawn over them as a shelter from the sun or rain. In such courts our Saviour often taught; and in one of them, according to some commentators, he was sitting when the man sick of the palsy was let down (through the covering or curtain, which was removed) into the midst (of the area), before Jesus; Luke v. 19. But does *διὰ τῶν κεράμων* signify the removal of an awning? or are we not to translate the words, *the tiling of the*

roof over an apartment? Round the court were, and still are in the East, a number of rooms; and those on the ground-floor being used for stores or offices, there were lofts or stories—sometimes three—one above the other, with galleries like those of old inns in London, communicating to the different apartments. Some of these had an ante-room and an inner chamber, 1 Kings xx. 30, xxii. 25. The bedchamber was a room where mattresses were stored, and not a sleeping-place, like ours; 2 Chron. xxii. 11.

The upper rooms were the principal apartments. Such was that prepared for our Saviour to eat the passover; such was the real scene of the palsied man's cure, Luke v. 19; and St. Paul was preaching in an upper-chamber at Troas, when Eutychus, overcome with slumber, fell from the third loft, *τρίστειγον*, or *cœnaculum*, *étage*, into the court.

The roofs of the houses were not sloped, as rain seldom fell, but covered with plaster, or thin layers of earth, having a pavement of flat tiles, and surrounded by parapets (Deut. xxii. 8) or low railings, 2 Kings i. 2. Here the cool air of the evening was enjoyed; and from hence David saw and fell into the temptation of Bathsheba: here flax was dried (Josh. ii. 6), evening conversations held (Luke xii. 3), mattresses laid for sleeping-places, and the booths erected for the feast of tabernacles, Nehem. viii. 16. These roofs were often sought at noon as places of retirement and devotion: here Peter was found, at the sixth hour, or noon, when the vision of the great sheet descended; Acts x. 9.

From one of these flat roofs there was a communication to the others, terminating in a staircase at the end of the street. By this way, I presume to affirm, the bearers of the paralytic approached, Luke v. 19; and thus, too, those would escape who, in the destruction of Jerusalem, should comply with the instructions of our Lord, *Let not him that is on the house-top come down to take any thing in the house*, Matt. xxiv. 17.

In building houses, large pins or nails were fixed in the walls, on which articles were hung, Isa. xxii. 23, Ezra ix. 8: these were the *πάσσαλοι*, *Odyssey*, α'. 440, θ'. 67.

The interior of Jewish houses was plain or decorated, in pro-

portion to the fortune of their possessors. The walls of rooms belonging to the better sort were adorned with hangings of cloth, silk, or leather, all of various colours; and the ceilings with paintings, carving, and gilding—allusions to which are found in Haggai i. 4, Jer. xxii. 14. The floors were of tiles and plaster, and covered with carpets, on which, or on mats or skins, persons sat cross-legged, sometimes spreading their garments on them as bed clothes. Hence the reason for the ordinance enjoining a man to restore his poor neighbour's garment, pledged for a loan, before night, *that he may sleep in his own raiment*, Deut. xxiv. 13, Exod. xxii. 26, 27.

The usual beds, however, were light mattresses, laid any where, and easily rolled up and put aside; which explains our Saviour's *Arise, and take up thy bed and walk*, Matt. ix. 6, Mark ii. 9, 11, John v. 11, 12.

Chairs were never used; but round the room were ranged low couches (like what we call ottomans) with cushions, leaning against the walls; and in these the corner seat, as the most easy, was (as it still is in the East) the most honourable. Hither Jacob retired when blind with age, while his two grandsons Ephraim and Manasseh were brought to him; and, raising himself on the couch, crossed his hands—by a gesture natural in his position—instead of extending them, by which mistake the blessing of the first-born fell upon Ephraim the younger; Gen. xlviii. 10, 13, &c.

One end of the room was raised higher than the rest, like what was called the *dais*; and here the couch of persons of condition was placed, sometimes on an adorned frame of ivory, Amos vi. 4; and persons were said to *go up* to it, 2 Kings i. 4, Ps. cxxxii. 3. Here Hezekiah turned his face to the wall, for the purpose of secret prayer, 2 Kings xx. 2; and Ahab, to conceal or nurse his disappointment under the refusal of Naboth's vineyard, 1 Kings xxi. 4.

The other articles of furniture were simple. A kneading-trough (Exod. xii. 34) and a hand-mill (Exod. xi. 5, Matt. xxiv. 41) belonged to every house. Chests for treasure, of cedar (a bitter wood, which *moth might not corrupt*), platters, earthenware-pots, dishes, cups, leathern bottles for wine, and

knives—but not forks*—are mentioned in Scripture among the domestic utensils of the Jews.

As luxury increased, the Roman triclinium was introduced at feasts; and the master or director of a feast, who arranged the guests and superintended the entertainments, was called the ἀρχιτρίκλινος, or governor of the feast; John ii. 8, 9.

Three long couches were placed on three sides of a rectangular table, the fourth side being left open for the servants to remove the dishes. The guests lay with their feet outward, leaning on their left arm, and taking food with their right: this explains the Magdalene's anointing the Saviour, and wiping his feet with her hair, which only required her going round the back of the triclinium. It likewise elucidates the appellation of John, as the disciple who lay in Jesus' bosom; and the beckoning of Peter, that he might ask the Saviour who should be the traitor; for no one sat opposite to each other at the triclinium, and John had only to throw himself back on his left arm, that he might ask the question on his Master's breast; John xiii. 23-25. The earliest mode of taking meals, was sitting to eat and drink: כָּשָׁן, ἐκάθισεν, Exod. xxxii. 6, quoted 1 Cor. x. 7; and this seems to have been the Egyptian custom.

234. Is the genuineness of the historical books of the New Testament essential?

The genuineness of *prophetical* writings is essential, because the character of the prophet, his estimation among his contemporaries, and the strength of his claims to Divine communication, are, in the first instance, and while fulfilment is yet distant, the measures of the confidence to be reposed on the real inspiration of his predictions. But it is quite different in *historical* writings; where, if the facts be authentic, it matters not who is the narrator. Now, as to the authenticity of the facts related in

* The *veru* of the ancients seems to have been a warlike instrument. Forks were first seen in the north of Italy, by the traveller Lithgow, in the reign of James the First. *He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish*, intimates the mode of eating in the time of our Lord, and in the East at this day, and explains the necessity for washing the hands (Matt. xxvi. 23) both before and after meat.

the Gospels and Acts, we have the testimony, the perseverance in suffering, the triumphant deaths of numbers of witnesses. Not that the genuineness is unimportant, for it is desirable to know that the writers are men of good character, who had opportunity of knowing the facts they attest, as in the instance before us. Two of them, witnesses and historians, were apostles; and the other two, Mark and Luke, the companions and fellow-travellers of apostles. The genuineness of the Gospels and Acts was never disputed in the church in any age, but acknowledged from the time of the earliest Fathers. The Gospels of Matthew and John bear intrinsic marks of being written by eye-witnesses; and the style of John expresses his character, and tallies with that of his Epistles and the Apocalypse.

Luke writes in the plural number *we*; and Matthew's Gospel is not the less genuine because he mentions himself in the third person singular. There are other collateral proofs of genuineness. But this is not essential in a mere record of facts. If an account of an engagement is gazetted as authentic, we do not ask or care whether the despatch was written by the general or his secretary.

235. *Was the writer of the Acts himself witness to any of the facts there related?*

The writer of the Acts was certainly St. Luke, as we see by comparing Luke i. 3 with Acts i. 1. He was the companion of Paul in his voyage to Italy, as is evident from his change of style to *we* in the 27th and 28th chapter of Acts; and he must have been eye-witness to all the facts mentioned in these chapters. He remained with Paul in Rome, when other friends had deserted him: *only Luke is with me*, 2 Tim. iv. 11.

236. *On what two points does the authority of God's testimony depend?*

His omniscience and his veracity. We may confide in his *omniscience* for the authority of his testimony. He sees every thing afar off, and can predict the future as one relating an account of the past: hence belief in his prophecies, and reliance on his promises.

It were blasphemy to affirm that God does not see all things, all events, past, present, and to come, in his own universe; although how to reconcile this with the free-will of man, and the contingency of events, be a mystery which we cannot fathom. Hence all things must be either by his choice or permission; and he cannot but foreknow what he chooses to permit. Again, the *veracity* of God is the other ground for reliance on his testimony. If the devil be the father of lies, God is the fountain of truth; *and the truth of God endureth for ever*, Ps. cxvii. 2. God hath, in the Scriptures, announced many things which have been exactly fulfilled, and this establishes a general ground of confidence in *all* his declarations. He must speak truth, for he must speak of things as they are, and will be; and they are according to the pleasure of his wisdom and benevolence, who, in foretelling them, is the faithful and true witness, Rev. i. 5. *God is not a man, that he should lie; or the son of man, that he should repent. Hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?* Num. xxiii. 19. *He is faithful that hath promised*, Heb. xi. 11, Rom. iv. 21. *For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance*, that is, without alteration; since to alter would shew some defect in the original wisdom that planned. For these reasons, again, we confide in the authority of the divine testimony, in the fulfilment of prophecy, and in the unchangeableness of the promises. Nor does this at all render prayer nugatory; for he may have made the prayer the condition or instrument of granting the favour. His promises imply the fitness of the recipient; and so too are his prophecies conditional. Witness the reversal of the doom of Nineveh and of Hezekiah, and the regret over Jerusalem that it had obstructed his intention to preserve it.

237. *Prove, from the constitution of things, that there can be only one God?*

Creation is governed by general laws, which bespeak an unity of design. The order and regularity of all the heavenly bodies; the comparative anatomy of all animals, and their resemblance, in generation and growth, to vegetables; the uniform structure of organised beings — all manifest obedience to one

directing mind. If there were more Gods than one, there would be proof of such plurality in some contending power, some discrepancy from the one general law: but there is none. The existence of matter and the existence of evil proves nothing in contradiction to the principle of unity, since God could have created the one and permitted the other for wise purposes.

All ancient nations, in the early period of their existence, have acknowledged but one God. There is no other way of production now but generation; and the power of God over matter is proved by the constant decomposition and change which the material world is undergoing, while all animals and plants called into life display a beautiful regularity and symmetry. But chiefly is unity apparent in the universal law of death throughout the animal and vegetable world.

God is eternal, self-existent, and omnipotent, and to suppose another such being would be to limit these qualities; and to suppose one without these qualities, is to make an inferior and dependent being, which is to give up the point, and to establish the Divine unity. One all-wise and almighty Being is *sufficient* to produce all the effects we behold: more would destroy uniformity.

Every objection to the unity of God drawn from the existence of matter or of evil, is answered by the control he possesses over both. He who says to the raging ocean, *Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther*, holds the same power over all nature, and can either restrain or mitigate evil. *I create evil, saith the Lord*, Isa. xlv. 7. He holds the reins over matter and mind alike. See Question 290.

238. *Are water and the Holy Spirit ever mentioned in Scripture as corresponding with each other?*

Both descend from heaven, and both are of a refreshing nature. *For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground. I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring*, Isa. xlv. 3. *In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should*

receive, &c. John vii. 37 and 39. This was an allusion to a custom on the Hosanna Rabbah (the last day of the feast of tabernacles), of drawing water from the pool of Siloam, and carrying it into the Temple to fill the brazen sea. *Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation*, Isa. xii. 3. *But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life*, John iv. 14.

Water is the grand purifier, and throughout Scripture the symbol of spiritual cleansing. Hence, whenever baptism is enjoined, it is considered as emblematic of the Spirit of God, by which the baptised person is purified in the laver of regeneration from the guilt of original sin. The ark arising after the deluge from the waters, laved from the sin in which the world had been drowned, is a type of regeneration by baptism; and the children of Israel were all baptised unto Moses in the Red Sea and in the cloud. The Spirit of God hovered like a dove over the ceremony when Jesus was baptised by John in Jordan; not that he was tainted with sin, but that it became him to fulfil all righteousness; Matt. iii. 14, 15. *Repent, and be baptised for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost*, Acts ii. 38. *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, John iii. 5. Water-baptism is, in all cases, accompanied by grace, or the Holy Spirit, which may, however, be subsequently lost or improved: and they greatly err who call the baptismal sprinkling only an emblem of spiritual descent, which may or may not take place in advanced life, as it may please the arbitrary will of God to grant or to withhold it—to grant it to the elect, or to withhold it from the reprobate. The differences on this matter, which at first sight seem a dispute about a word, have become a covert way of arguing the Calvinistic and Arminian controversy; and hence the meaning of “regeneration” derives its importance. While one body in the church say that *all* baptised persons are for the time *regenerate*, another limits the phrase to those only whom God hath predetermined to regenerate or *save*.

239. *What direction does St. Paul give respecting things offered to idols—going to law with the brethren—the eucharist—speaking with tongues, and prophesying?*

St. Paul was convinced that an idol was nothing in the world; and that as to the victims offered to it, whether we eat or eat not any part of them, made, abstractedly considered, no alteration in our condition before God, who was the only real God, 1 Cor. viii. 4. Howbeit there are some of more delicate consciences, who consider meat that had been offered to an idol as a thing sinful to be eaten, particularly at a feast in the idol's temple; wherein to assist would seem to imply a communion in that idol's worship—as the eucharist implies a communion in the faith of Christ. On both these accounts, the apostle enjoins the disciples of Christ to beware of casting a stumbling-block in the way of weak brethren, who might thereby be emboldened to join in such a participation, which, while their conscience revolted against it, would be in them sin, 1 Cor. viii. 10, 11; and sin against Christ, in those who so used their liberty in an indifferent matter, as to be the occasion of sin in their brethren, 1 Cor. x. 14; Warburton's *Div. Leg.*, vol. vi. p. 296.

We are to avoid constructive idolatry; and whether we eat or drink, to do all to the glory of God. But excepting the idolatrous sacrificial feasts, which were to be avoided, as some portion of the victims was brought forward at private tables, or publicly sold; whatsoever was sold in the shambles in this manner they were allowed to eat, asking no questions as to whence it came, 1 Cor. x. 25, 27. Still, however, with the reservation, that if any one should remind them that any certain meat had been offered to an idol, they were to refrain, both for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience' sake, ver. 28.

St. Paul's sentiments respecting *going to law with the brethren*, are contained in 1 Cor. vi. His first advice given to the Corinthians, is rather to take wrong, and suffer themselves to be defrauded, than go to law before a heathen judge; but if they would dispute points of right and wrong, they ought to do it among themselves (the saints) by arbitration, at any rate in

small matters, instead of going to law before unbelievers; to whom, that is, to heathen judges, there was no appeal.

With respect to the eucharist, he desired that it should be partaken with due discernment of the Lord's body, and after proper self-examination, not as if men were assembled merely to indulge their fleshly appetites, the reasonable calls of which should be previously satisfied at home: for, *What? have ye not houses to eat and drink in?* 1 Cor. xi. 22. *This is not to eat the Lord's supper,* 1 Cor. xi. 20, 28. See the whole chapter from verse 17.

The next question relates to *speaking with tongues*, referring to Isaiah xxviii. 11, 12, as fulfilled on the first Pentecost after the ascension, and continued in the miraculous gift of tongues during the first age of the Church, for the promotion of the Gospel. He calls that gift a sign, not to them which believe, but to them which believe not: and accordingly it is to be exercised decently, and by speaking in order; since, an unbeliever entering one of their assemblies, and hearing a miscellany and Babel of tongues spoken together, would only receive an impression of general insanity. Those gifted with tongues must therefore succeed one another in a course; while, at the same time, there should be always one to interpret: or if there should be no interpreter, the speaker must repress his gift, and keep silence. *For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, in all churches of the saints,* 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

But though not enjoined wholly to check, but only to *regulate* the use of tongues, the brethren were to covet as a better gift that of prophecy; which serves less for them that believe not, than to confirm the faith of them which *believe*. In this place the word prophecy (*προφητεία*) is to be taken in its latitude of interpretation, as speaking forth, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, doctrines, exhortations, or foretellings, which might tend to the edification and comfort of the Church; but here, too, the disciples were to *prophecy one by one, that all might learn and all might be comforted*, 1 Cor. xiv. 31. It was further enjoined, that the words uttered should be easy to be understood, otherwise the prophets would speak into the air, and be to the hearers as barbarians. Unlearned persons could

not say amen to a foreign language, or to that which they did not understand, and therefore could not be edified. All this implies that the prophecy should be uttered in the vernacular tongue of the persons addressed,—as is implied in what St. Paul says of himself: *I thank my God that I speak with tongues more than ye all; yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue*, 1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19.

But there was one thing better still than both these gifts; and the faithful were commanded earnestly to covet this, as the best gift of all,—love to God, fructifying in love to man, 1 Cor. xii. 31. This verse should not have been disjoined from the following chapter: for, *Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and though I have the gift of prophecy, and have not charity, I am become as a sounding trumpet or a clangorous cymbal*, 1 Cor. xiii. 1, is an illustration of the more excellent way of 1 Cor. xii. 31.

240. *To whom, and on what occasion, were the following words addressed: δει πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσέως καὶ προφῆταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ?*

To the eleven assembled apostles in Jerusalem, between our Lord's resurrection and ascension: when, by shewing them his hands and feet, and eating before them, he convinced them that he was not the spirit pretended by those Gnostics, who affirmed Christ to be a mere man, whom the Spirit of God entered at his baptism, and left before his death,—thus denying his resurrection.

Moses had exhibited this second Person in the investiture of the bush and pillar of fire; the prophet had said, *Thy dead men shall arise with my dead body*, Isaiah xxvi. 19; and in the Psalms it was said that his *flesh* should *rest in hope*, and that the Holy One should not see *corruption*, Ps. xvi. 9. The Psalms here signify the *hagiographa*, i. e. all the books not included in the Pentateuch and sixteen prophets.

241. Ὡρα δὲ ἦν ὡς δεκάτη. *What hour was this, according to our reckoning?* John i. 40.

Two hours before night, about the time of the passover, between four and five in the afternoon. This is, according to what is called the artificial day, from dawn to dark. The natural or civil day was twenty-four hours, beginning at different times, according to the customs of different nations. The Hebrews began their day after the evening, Levit. xxiii. 32, as did many nations, and as do the modern Italians. The Roman day, like that of most modern European nations, began at midnight. The late date of St. John's Gospel will explain the difference in regard to the hours of the morning of the crucifixion—the Roman method of computation having, by the time of John's writing his Gospel, crept into the East.

242. *What were the values of a denarius, shekel, mina, and drachma.*

The Greek drachma and the Roman denarius were nearly of equal value, viz. 7½d. English. That the drachma was the fourth part of a shekel, is proved by the conversation between the tax-gatherers and Peter, Matt. xvii. 24, to end. Does your master pay the διδραχμα, the double drachma, the tribute for an individual, equal to the half-shekel, or 1s. 3d., which every male had to pay as an offering to the Lord, Exod. xxx. 13, Num. xxviii. 26; and by the instructions of our Lord to that apostle to pay a stater, tetradrachmon, or shekel, for both. And this throws light on, *Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.* The Pharisees were directed, but unwilling, to pay both the civil and religious assessment. The mina (μνᾶ), translated pound in Luke xix. 13, was equal to fifty shekels, or 6l. 5s. All these coins were silver money.

243. *What are the principal mountains of Palestine?*

Lebanon and Antilebanon are two ridges, running parallel to each other, as part of the northern boundary of Palestine, with Cælo-Syria in the hollow (whence its name, κοιλία), between them. Mount Hermon begins on the north, and forms

part of the eastern boundary, containing Basan, famed for its bulls. Here "haughty Sirion bows his marble head," being another name for Hermon, Deut. iii. 9. There was a lesser Hermon, west of Jordan, a little to the south of Nazareth, coupled with Tabor in Psalm lxxxix. 12. As Hermon was a continuation of Lebanon, so were the mountains of Gilead a southern continuation of Hermon, along the eastern border of Manasseh and Gad beyond Jordan; in a country famous for a balsam, or balm, a liquid resin, obtained by incision of the *Amyris Gileadensis*, Psalm lx. 7, Jerem. viii. 22.

The next mountain-range southward is that of Abarim, that is, the over-Jordan mountains—as the Swiss say, Oberland. They run confusedly along the district of Reuben, and send forth a branch called Nebo, of which the highest summit was Pisgah. On the southern boundary of Canaan were Mount Seir, the dwelling of Esau, and Mount Halak.

Mount Ephraim was a range in the tribe of Ephraim, near Samaria; and the mountains of Gilboa were a little further north, in West Manasseh, where Saul and Jonathan fell in battle with the Philistines, 1 Sam. xxxi.; so finely lamented in the elegy of David, 2 Sam. i. 18. This range is still called Gibel Gilbo; Richardson's *Travels*.

Other single hills are Carmel, a promontory in the Mediterranean, and the dwelling-place of Elisha; Tabor, commonly considered as the Mount of Transfiguration, in Zebulun; the Mount of Beatitudes, near Capernaum; Ebal and Gerizim, in Ephraim, near Sychem, the place of the blessings and curses, Deut. xxvii., Joshua, viii.; Zion, Moriah, and Calvary, the three hills on which Jerusalem stood; and the Mount of Olives, the place of our Lord's ascension, near it on the east. The mountains of Quarantania, near Jericho, are the supposed scene of our Saviour's temptation; whence that name, signifying forty days, is derived.

244. *The powers and duties of the Roman procurators — names of the most noted.*

The most noted Roman procurators in Judea, in the time of our Lord and his apostles, were Cyrenius, Pilate, Felix, and

Festus. They are called *ἡγεμόνες*, by our translators rendered *governors*, although their proper title, which Josephus and Philo both give to Pilate, was *ἐπίτροποι*, or *procurators*: to whom, in the lesser provinces, the authority of *ἡγεμῶν* was often entrusted (including the administration of justice, and the power of life and death), in subordination, however, to the real president; as in Judea to that of Syria.

These last were *proprætors*, or *proconsuls*: *ἐπαρχοι* sent to the larger provinces *ἐπαρχῆαι*; but when, as in Judea, the *ἐπίτροπος* had the higher power entrusted to him, he received the name of *ἡγεμῶν*. Except in this case, the *ἐπίτροποι* were little better than collectors of the public revenue; for which purpose it was necessary that they should command a public registration. This registration, *ἀπογραφή* (Luke ii. 2) is improperly rendered "taxing;" for no taxing was levied on Judea till ten years after this period, that is, as Josephus says, after the banishment of Archelaus. But it was *ἀπογραφή πρώτη*, a preliminary enrolment, ordered by Augustus, and translated by inversion of the phrase. The word *first* (*ἀπογραφή πρώτη*) implies a *second*; and the words, *and this taxing was first made* (Luke ii. 2), should stand, "and this *first enrolment was made*," when Cyrenius (afterwards governor) was sent, as an officer of trust, into Judea for that specific purpose. The actual taxing was first made when Cyrenius (*Κυρήνιος*), called in Latin *Quirinius*, was *governor* of Syria. Now Saturninus was governor of Syria at the time of our Lord's birth, and it appears that Cyrenius was not made governor till nine years afterwards; but it is supposed by the commentators that a new enrolment was made preparatory to the *taxing* by Cyrenius. Whitby says that *πρώτη* is used by the Seventy to signify priority, as if it were *before* Cyrenius was governor. The whole parenthesis is thought by Chandler and Boyer to be an interpolation in a very early MS.

Coponius was governor of Judea, and Quirinius of Syria, from A.D. 6 to A.D. 10, that is, from the ninth to the thirteenth year of the Christian era. Pontius Pilate was governor from A.D. 26 to A.D. 36, that is, from the twenty-ninth year of Christ, for ten years. Felix, the freedman of Claudius, governed from

A.D. 52 to A.D. 60. Porcius Festus succeeded him in A.D. 60, and died in Judea A.D. 62.

Felix trembled before Paul's eloquence at Cæsarea, and was anxious to save him; but consulting expedience, and courteous rather than just, "that he might do the Jews a pleasure," he left him bound. Festus, too, was unwilling to condemn him, and even wished to hear him at Jerusalem; but Paul, seeing his jeopardy, appealed as a Roman citizen to Cæsar, who at that time was Nero.

245. *Was it lawful for a Roman citizen to be scourged?*

By the Lex Porcia no one could bind, scourge, or kill a Roman citizen; Adam's *Antiq.* p. 215; Liv. x. 9. Accordingly, when the chief captain of the prætorium at Jerusalem, *χλιαρχος*, was about to scourge Paul, he pleads his privilege, by demanding of the centurion, *as they bound him with thongs, Is it lawful to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?* Acts xxii. 25. He says, indeed, in 2 Cor. xi. 24, that he *five times received forty stripes, save one*, but it was *of the Jews*. Agreeably to the Mosaic law, Deut. xxv. 3, "forty stripes may the offender receive, and not exceed; and, lest they should transgress or miscount, they punished with a lash of three thongs,—thirteen blows of which made exactly thirty-nine stripes; Joseph. *Antiq.* lib. iv. cap. 8.

246. *Of what privilege of a Roman citizen did St. Paul avail himself when brought before Felix?*

That of the *jus Quiritium*, by which a Roman citizen might appeal from provincial or inferior magistrates, and by which no magistrate could punish him by stripes, or capitally; Cicero in *Verrem*, 54-57; Liv. xxix. 8.

247. *Jewish punishments.*

Before an accused person was condemned, dust was cast upon him by his accusers, who thus demand justice, and intimate that he deserves to be cast into the grave. Thus Shimei betrayed his hostility to David, throwing stones at him at the same time, 2 Sam. xvi. 13. And the Jewish populace seizing Paul in the

Temple, when he declared his vision at Damascus, cried out, *Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live; and they cried out, and cast off their clothes, and threw dust into the air, Acts xxii. 23.*

Accused persons, even in making their defence, were subject to the indignity of being smitten on the mouth, as Paul was by order of Ananias; but this, in strictness, was contrary to law, Acts xxiii. 2. Previous to conviction, they were likewise examined by scourging, by way of extorting confession from them, as the chief captain was proceeding to treat Paul, that he might know wherefore they cried so against him, Acts xxiii. 24, when the staggering plea of Roman citizenship stayed his hand. Pilate proposed this inferior punishment as a compromise with the Jewish populace, when they sought the crucifixion of our blessed Lord: *Why, what evil hath he done? I will therefore chastise him, and let him go, Luke xxiii. 22.* There was likewise a trial of ordeal, by drinking holy water mingled with dust (Numbers v. 17), where a woman was suspected of adultery.

Scourging indeed is often mentioned as a punishment both in the Old and New Testaments, and it was inflicted in proportion to the heinousness of the offence; whence our Lord's expression, *He that in ignorance did things worthy of stripes shall be beaten with few stripes, but he that knew his lord's will, and did it not, shall receive many stripes.* See Question 245.

The stripes were *not to exceed forty*. The lash was sometimes composed of ropes, or leather, and sometimes of rods and branches of trees. The whip was considered as a higher indignity than the rod. The offender was tied to a low pillar, on which he leant, that the executioner might easily reach his back. Our Saviour always mentions this dishonour as among the heaviest part of his sufferings, Matt. xx. 19, Mark x. 34, Luke xviii. 33; see Deut. xxv. 1-3. This was a punishment of the early confessors; *others had trial of scourgings*, Heb. xi. 36.

Another remarkable Jewish punishment was *retaliation* — *an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, life for life*, Exod. xxi. 23, 24, Levit. xxiv. 20, Deut. xix. 20, against which our Saviour remonstrates in the sermon on the Mount, Matt. v. 38, 39.

Restitution of stolen property, and compensation after other injuries, is enjoined in Exod. xxi. 32-34, 36, xxii. 1-3, 6, Levit. xxiv. 18-21. Zaccheus voluntarily restored fourfold, Luke xix. 8. Compensation for wrongs, where restitution was impracticable, or was too severe or too lenient a punishment, is commended in Exod. xxii. 1, xxi. 28-30. For some injuries a fivefold satisfaction was required, Exod. xxi.: none, however, for murder or homicide, Numb. xxxv. 31, 32. *Damnum, læsio, dolor, medicina, confusio*, were among the inferior civil punishments; Brown's *Antiq.* vol. ii. p. 194, &c. But as sin and trespass offerings were imposed as punishments for certain offences specified in the Levitical law, Lev. iv. 2, chiefly legal defilements, or slighter trespasses, the passages in Lev. v. 1, 2, 7, 15, Lev. xix. 22, relate to the seduction of a bondmaid, whose condition prevented resistance. There is no law of Moses sanctioning imprisonment, but it prevailed during the Jewish monarchy, and in the time of Christ; Joseph was imprisoned in Egypt, Gen. xli. 14; Jeremiah let down into a miry dungeon, Jer. xxxviii. 6; Daniel cast into a lion's den; and the apostles put into a common prison, Acts v. 18. The sighing of the prisoners comes before God, Ps. lxxix. 11, and he hears their groaning, Ps. cii. 20; consequently they are prisoners of hope, Zech. ix. 12; for God looseth the prisoners, Ps. cxlvi. 7; and Christ says to the spiritual prisoners, *Go forth*, Is. xlix. 9.

Banishment was not introduced till after the captivity, and must have been to those who wept by Babel's willows a sore evil. John was banished to Patmos, but by the Roman power. When a prisoner was dangerous by his power or prowess, *his eyes were put out*. Such was the lot of Samson, Judges xvi. 21; and Zedekiah (2 Kings xxv. 7) suffered this punishment at Riblah, previous to his being carried to Babylon; whereby two seemingly contradictory prophecies were fulfilled: the one that he should be carried to Babylon, Jer. xxxii. 5, and the other that he should not see that city, Ezek. xii. 13.

Plucking off the hair was a violent act, practised by Nehemiah towards Jews who had married heathen wives, Neh. xiii. 25.

Excommunication, or exclusion from sacred worship, was of three sorts: the first, or removal, was a temporary cutting

out from the synagogue, John ix. 22, xvi. 2. Of the second, **הֶרֶם** (*herem*), anathema, total separation, or amputation, by which the excluded person was delivered over to Satan with a solemn curse, 1 Cor. iv. 5, Rom. ix. 2. The third excommunication was called **מָרַן אַתָּה** *maran-atha* (Chaldee), "the Lord cometh," intimating that the criminal had thenceforward nothing to expect but judgment. When *anathema* was prefixed to this word, it signified both the second and third excommunications — a person separated or accursed, and given over to the vengeance of the Lord, 1 Cor. xiii. 3, xvi. 22, &c. From inferior punishments we go on to those which were capital.

1. *Slaying with the sword* might be inflicted in any way the executioner thought proper. Nothing protected the murderer; but the manslayer might flee to a city of refuge, where he might remain unmolested until the death of the high-priest; but if overtaken in his way by the **גֹּאֵל** (*goel*), or next of kin, he might be slain with impunity, Numb. xxxv. 26, 27. Paul alludes to this exemption in Heb. vi. 18, by fleeing to a city of refuge, there to remain while "the High-priest for ever" lives; and he calls it "laying hold on the hope set before us, an anchor of the soul." Adonijah and Joab saved their lives by laying hold of the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, 1 Kings i. 50, ii. 28.

2. The punishment of idolatry was *stoning*; as was likewise that of blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking, and such kindred crimes as dishonoured God, *e. g.* giving children to Moloch, having familiar spirits, rebellion against parental authority, a seduced damsel's passing herself off for a virgin. As this punishment had a tumultuous character, it was necessary that the responsible witnesses should cast the first stones; after which the multitude threw a promiscuous shower of stones. Stephen, however, (Acts vii. 59) and Paul (Acts xiv. 19) are thought to have been stoned by the mob taking the law into their own hands; yet were there witnesses or accusers in Stephen's case, according to Deut. xvii. 6, 7. This received the name of the *rebel's beating*, and was practised without form of trial. Hence the Jews so often took up stones to cast at our blessed Lord, John viii. 59. There was another mode of stoning, by dropping a large rock or slab, as big as two men could lift, on the breast

of the criminal, from a height, by which he was crushed at once, see Zech. xii. 3; and hence the explanation of Matt. xxi. 44 and Luke xx. 18, *whosoever shall fall on this stone*, he to whomsoever this doctrine of the Messiah shall be a rock of offence, shall be broken, or encounter sorrow, "though with power of repentance;" *but on whomsoever it shall fall in judgment it shall grind him to powder*, crush him (λκμήσει), as a mill-stone, in utter ruin, Rom. ix. 33, 1 Peter ii. 8.

Burning alive is another punishment, denounced against the harlotry of the daughter of a priest, Lev. xxi. 9. This preceded the law, as is seen in the case of Tamar, Gen. xxxviii. 24; and was a Babylonish punishment, Jer. xxix. 22, Dan. iii. 6.

Various capital punishments, not Levitical, were borrowed from the heathens, with whom the Jews had intercourse. Herod *beheaded* John the Baptist, Matt. xiv. 8-12; Jezebel was *thrown from a window*, 2 Kings ix. 30, see 2 Chron. xxv. 12; and the men of Nazareth sought to cast our Saviour from a precipice, Luke iv. 29. *Drowning*, Matt. xviii. 6; *pounding in a mortar*, Prov. xxvii. 22; *cutting or sawing asunder, beating to death*, (Heb. xi. 35), and *exposure to wild beasts*, are mentioned in Scripture, but not as Jewish punishments. *Crucifixion* was a death of lingering torture, aggravated by disgrace, being only inflicted on slaves and the worst criminals. Hence our Lord *endured the cross, despising the shame*, Rom. v. 8, Heb. xii. 2; *and took the form of a servant* (δούλου), *and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross*, Phil. ii. 7, 8.

248. *The first and second temple.*

The question is answered in No. 223. As the grand architectural difference was the enclosed court of the Gentiles, this indicated a growing spirit of toleration towards Gentiles abhorring idolatry, and worshipping the one true God; and our Saviour's zeal for overthrowing the tables of traffic, in what he called his Father's house, and the house of prayer, taught a reverential toleration for all professions of religion renouncing idolatry.

249. *What is the meaning of συκοφαντέω in the passage εἰ τινός τι συκοφάνησα ; and mention the Levitical law of restitution.*

This word literally signifies, *to inform against an exporter of figs*. In the earliest times of Athens it was criminal, in time of scarcity, to export that article of food. Litigious persons indicted the exporters ; and this law not being repealed during plenty, gave occasion to the malicious to accuse the transgressors against the letter of it. Whence all busy informers, whose object is to curry favour with the party informed, have been termed *sycophants*. In Luke xix. 8, iii. 14, it signifies not only frivolous but false *accusation*, and is so translated. The law of restitution was the *lex talionis*, extended according to the crime or injury ; an ox or a sheep stolen was to be restored fourfold, Exod. xxii. 1. David decreed this restitution against the imaginary oppressor of Nathan's parable, 2 Sam. xii. 6 ; and hence Zaccheus adhered strictly to the letter of the law, in saying, *If I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold*.

250. *On what grounds did the Jews attempt to deny that Christ was the Messiah ?*

I. *Howbeit we know this man whence he is ; but when Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence he is*, John vii. 27. They probably derived this notion from Isaiah liii. 8, *Who shall declare his generation ?* Yet the particulars of his birth and the branch of his family were pointed out. So there were two genealogies of Jesus, tracing him from David : and at the same time it is said, *His goings forth were from everlasting*, Micah v. 2. These seeming contradictions are reconciled by admitting his Divine origin and human character.

II. *Shall Christ come out of Galilee ? out of Galilee cometh no prophet*, John vii. 41, 52. Here they cited a proverb of contempt, and considered not their own prophet ; for Isaiah (ix. 2) had predicted that a great light was to come out of Galilee of the Gentiles, quoted Matt. iv. 16. *The land of Zabulon and the land of Nephthalim have seen a great light*, Isaiah ix. 2,

Matt. iv. 15. Capernaum, the usual dwelling-place of Jesus, his own city, lay on the limits of both.

III. *Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?* John i. 46. This, too, was likewise a proof of blindness; for Nazareth was only the place of Christ's sojourning; and it had been said of Samson, an acknowledged type of the Messiah, that he should be called a Nazarene,—a name given to the early Christians, Judges xiii. 7, Matt. ii. 23. But Bethlehem, the city of David, was appointed by prophecy as the place of his birth, Micah v. 2; and the wonderful working of Providence, which brought about an occasion for the removal of his parents to that city, ought rather to have been admired.

IV. Their gross expectation of a mighty conqueror and temporal king. Their imaginations and passions dwelt only on those parts of prophecy which were sensual accommodations to their ideas of power and dignity, while they passed over the distinct predictions which described their Messiah as of no form, or comeliness, or reputation, despised and rejected of men, numbered with transgressors, and led like a sheep to the slaughter. But, on the contrary, their views were fixed on a king having dominion, whetting his glistening sword, making his bow ready, trampling his enemies, and extending his worldly dominion from sea to sea. They were offended at the lowly Galilean, and overlooked a kingdom which was spiritual, peaceful, and perpetual—a kingdom not of this world.

V. Their prejudices against his divine nature. Surrounded as the ancient Jews were by idolators, and slow as they were of understanding, it was necessary to fix in their minds, without the possibility of misapprehension or confusion, the doctrine of one supreme and sole God; and as the Divinity of the second and third persons might mislead such a people into tritheism, it was not brought forward in the Old Testament in that full and distinct relief in which it was exhibited in the Gospel. And accordingly, when our Lord laid claim to divinity, and they took up stones to cast at him, they exclaimed, *For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because thou, being a man, makest thyself God*, John x. 33.

VI. The Jews were judicially blinded. They had neglected

the prophets who announced their Messiah, and were ill disposed to reverence the Son of God himself, so that *in them was fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias (Isa. vi. 9) which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their hearts, and should be converted, and I should heal them,* Matt. xiii. 14, 15.

VII. But the chief reason for the rejection of the Messiah by the Jews is that mentioned by St. John (iii. 19), *And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men have loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.* They had been accustomed to a religion of observances and external ceremonies, whose hidden meaning they had no desire to discover; and they hated that doctrine which searched the heart and the thoughts, and taught that God is a spirit, and would be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

251. Difference between our present Liturgy and that used before the Reformation.

When our reformers separated from the church of Rome, it was only against its positive abuses and corruptions that they protested. They still remembered, that these corruptions slowly crept in, one after another, in the dark ages; that in the first three centuries the doctrines of the church were pure, and its divines orthodox; that in point of divine commission, and of authorised government, it was apostolical; and that it thus had a claim to veneration by its antiquity, and by all those forms which had not been tainted with a leaven of evil. They therefore were studious to retain, as nearly as difference of times and circumstances permitted, the order of its public services, and those devotions which were sanctified as the composition of the earlier and even later fathers—*e. g.* Basil, Gregory, Ambrose, A.D. 397, and Chrysostom, A.D. 407. One essential alteration called for and effected at the Reformation, was the translation of the public forms of prayer out of Latin into the vernacular language of England, by which they might be made intelligible

to the common people. The mass of legendary saints' days was also struck out of the calendar, and commemorations reserved only for the apostles and a few others connected with the history and times of our Lord. As commerce required more time than formerly for the active duties of life, and printing distributed knowledge from churches and schools into private studies, it was deemed advisable that the seven services of the ancient church,—viz. 1st, nocturns or vigils, and matins or lauds, (both called *matins*); 2d, prime, or the first hour, as day might break, at three, four, or five; followed by the third, sixth, and ninth hours; 6th, vespers; and 7th, complin, or completerium, —should all be compressed into two services, morning and evening prayer; referring the text, *pray without ceasing*, to the constant spirit of devotion which ought to animate the whole tenour of active life (*Palmer on the Liturgy*). In the commission of 1548 for constructing the new liturgy, it was resolved to change nothing for the sake of change, but to restore the standard of the purer ages of the Gospel, by abolishing erroneous doctrines and unnecessary ceremonies, which popery had introduced and multiplied. With these views, the commission proceeded to extract a service out of the breviaries, missals, and rituals of the old religion. These terms are often confounded; but a breviary is the matins, lauds, &c.; a missal is a book for the holy sacrament; and a ritual is a book of the occasional offices (*Shepherd on the Liturgy*, page 275). If we compare the ancient matins with the matins in Edward's First Book, we shall find that the compilers of our liturgy studied, as they professed, neither to please those who were so addicted to their old customs, that they thought it a great matter of conscience to depart from a piece of the least of their ceremonies; nor, on the other hand, those who would innovate in all things, and admit nothing that was not new: so that they attempted not so much to satisfy either of these parties, as to please God and profit them both.*

Matins began with the Lord's prayer, Ave-maria, and the

* Henry VIII. In 1534 the Reformation began in England. In 1537 the committee of convocation published *The Godly Institution of a Christian*

creed, said privately by priest and people, with a low voice, all kneeling. Then, as all rose, the priest repeated the services after the Lord's prayer (signing himself on the mouth and body), the Gloria Patri, the Invitatory, Venite exultemus, Psalms, and lessons. After the lessons were read homilies from Gregory, Austin, and Bede. The litany was a separate service. Bennett says, that one-fourteenth part of the present service is taken from popish liturgies. The liturgy of Edward VI. placed the litany between the communion service and baptism. The Ave-marias and crossings, with other popish trumpery, were dismissed; but the substance and order of the service were both retained.

Cranmer, avoiding a violation of the feelings of the people, preserved much in the *first* liturgy as *tolerabiles ineptiæ*: such were unction, prayer for departed souls, &c. On consulting some foreigners, Bucer and Martyr, these were expunged from the *second*, in which the sentences, exhortation, confession, and absolution, were prefixed to the Lord's prayer. See Question 74, &c. for a farther account of the liturgy. These prefixes were a silent and satisfactory way of getting rid of any secret confession to a priest, and any absolution from him as a matter of private authority.

252. *The criteria of true miracles applied to the principal ones in the New Testament, and to those of Moses and Joshua in the Old Testament.*

Throughout the whole of creation God works by established laws, and hath appointed certain causes to produce certain effects. A departure from these general rules, not to be admitted, containing the Lord's prayer, Ave-maria, creed, ten commandments, and seven sacraments.

1540. An enlarged edition of the same book, called *The Erudition and Necessary Doctrine of a Christian Man*.

1541. Litanies ordered to be translated into English.

1545. *The King's Primer*, or order for Morning and Evening Prayer, not very different from our present Common Prayer.

Edward VI. 1547. Communion in both kinds ordered.

The same commission prepared offices for Sundays and holydays, baptism, &c., and thus made our liturgy complete, in the second and third years of Edward VI.

counted for by the ordinary principle of cause and effect, is a miracle; and it is evident that the same omnipotence which laid down the general rule, may permit or enjoin an occasional violation of it. An extraordinary event, such as an earthquake, or the giving sight by couching, is not a miracle, because it proceeds as an effect from a cause.

The criteria of a true miracle must be, 1st, that it cannot be accounted for by any known or conceivable natural law; 2d, that it cannot be conceived to happen by a juggle of legerdemain, by imposition, or by collusion, and, consequently, that it be attested by a sufficient number of competent and credible witnesses; 3d, that it be wrought for some important or urgent purpose, such as that of bearing testimony to the veracity of the operator, or of carrying a great and beneficent design through naturally insuperable obstacles; 4th, that this design be for the necessary information and spiritual advantage of the human race; 5th, that the doctrine, precepts, and example of the operator be favourable to piety and morality.

The principal miracles of the New Testament are—the healing of diseases with a word, and the raising of the dead. Now it is impossible that any cause in nature could have produced these effects of itself; and even spittle applied to the eyes of a blind man, or *ephphatha* spoken in the ear, though an ostensible means, is not an adequate cause of sight or hearing. There could be no juggle or imposition, for the miracles were repeated, wrought in open day, and in the presence of multitudes, hostile and unwilling to be convinced, and never denied as facts even by the enemies of the Gospel. There could be no collusion among the witnesses, for they were numerous, honest, simple, competent to bear testimony to facts, and not prepossessed by enthusiasm. They sealed their testimony with patient suffering, and many of them with their blood. These miracles were wrought in order to carry infant Christianity through the opposition of Jewish prejudice, philosophical pride, the interests of Pagan priests, and the licentiousness of the Gentile populace. They enforced doctrines of the utmost importance to be known, and promoted the highest welfare of man, namely, the immortality of the soul, and the remission of sins by a Saviour. The

great Operator himself went about doing good : *never man spake like unto him, and in his mouth was found no guile.*

The miracles wrought by Moses and Joshua bore the same character. No natural cause could save the first-born of Israel, while those of Egypt were destroyed ; or separate the Red Sea twelve miles down its channel, and three miles broad ; or smite a rock, and draw abundant water for half a million of persons from it. No natural manna, such as now exudes from trees in the East, could feed 600,000 persons, giving a double quantity one day, and none on the Sabbath ; and surely no one but one commissioned from God could arrest the course of the sun and moon, or of the earth, which is the same thing. Neither in these public transactions could there be juggle, collusion, or imposition ; and 600,000 men could not be persuaded that they happened merely on being told that they happened, and in their own lifetime. These miracles were wrought to bring the chosen people out of a land of bondage, to support them forty years in a dry and barren wilderness, and to establish them in a land of freedom and plenty. They were wrought for the high purposes of weaning that people from idolatry, shewing them that there was one Almighty God, and instructing them in their origin, duties, and destination. They were wrought to give authority to Moses as an inspired lawgiver ; and to Joshua, his successor, as a leader commissioned from God. Not so the pretended miracles of heathenism, and the impudent deceptions of popery. Some of these have been accounted for on natural principles, by the subsequent discoveries of science. Some were barefaced impositions,—as the back entrance to the oracular table in the temple of Isis at Portici ; and the streamlet, over which three holes or pits are built, to mark the three skips of St. Paul's head, under the altar of the Tre Fontane at Rome. None of these false miracles were wrought in favour of claims to inspiration in the teacher, or in proof of the authenticity of a new revelation. They are mean, juggling, smuggled, and ridiculous, performed to obtain a temporary credit and interest for designing and worldly men. They are wrought before persons *willing* to be deceived, or in dark ages, when philosophy cannot reason on cause and effect, and is content to wonder and to swallow any

thing. They are wrought in confirmation of some system *already* established, forgetful of the declaration of God, *If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.* They are wrought in the dark,—like the melting of the coagulated blood of St. Januarius at Naples; and contrary to that principle of the economy of miracles which confined them to the time of a new-born religion, while yet in its swaddling-bands, and removes them when it can go by itself, to afford scope, in a state of probation, for faith.

253. *The Scriptures could not have been the contrivance of man.*

I. Where there is human contrivance, it must either be that of one individual, or of one having influence over others, or of several leaguings together. The Scriptures exhibit one uniform and consistent plan, carried on, through four thousand years, by many writers, prophets, and agents, too remote from each other to be influenced by one human individual, or to unite in a league of imposition; and yet so seemingly contradictory, that no one impostor could hope to fulfil them all. When have men conspired in a wilful deception for one thousand years? Or, did any heathen idolatry, or any sect of philosophers, ever attain universal dominion, or even seek it?

II. They consist of an economy of prophecies and types in an early age of the world, wonderfully realised by facts which happened nearly two thousand years afterwards. These prophecies embraced the rise and fall of empires, in connexion with one grand remote fact, and gave particulars of place, family, circumstance, and time, which no human contrivance could have foreseen or suspected.

III. Wonderful stories, designed to impose on men, are usually legends of dark ages, and presented to the world in reliance upon its credulity. The whole history of the Gospel was introduced in the Augustan age, a period of high civilisation and inquisitiveness, when the philosophers, the guides of opinion, despised the followers of idolatry, and were in a temper to detect and disrobe any other attempt at deception. Yet the fact of the miraculous or historical parts of the Gospel was never denied

either by Jew or Gentile. The Jews referred them to Beelzebub; the Gentiles deemed the narrators deceivers; and prejudice, precluding calm inquiry, branded the apostles as turning the world upside down. Their story, then, was not one of human contrivance.

IV. It is a wise maxim, independent of Scripture,—that if this counsel or this work be of God, ye cannot overthrow it: if of man, it will come to nought. The Gospel produced, in a few years, a sudden, rapid, extensive, and unparalleled change in the affairs of the whole world. Thousands and tens of thousands flocked around its standard, with the certainty of persecution, and the full expectation of martyrdom. These, the best judges, as being the nearest to the facts, must have sifted the story, and found it not to be a human contrivance.

V. There is harmony in all the parts of Scripture. There never was a contrivance so ingenious and deep, as that some part did not jar against the rest, and betray the artifice. There is neither history, doctrine, nor maxim in Scripture, that is inconsistent with the whole scheme; and even the minutest parts are subservient to the main object. Many of the predictions have been fulfilled since they were delivered, and some are now in the course of fulfilment. Any contrivers of a story could not know the counsels of God as to futurity.

254. *The leading forms of church-government, the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, and the Independent.*

The *Episcopalian* form of government is that of a church governed by bishops, as successors of the apostles, with two subordinate orders of the ministry, viz. priests and deacons. A bishop is the overseer, *ἐπίσκοπος* of the churches in a district, called a diocese. Episcopal government was alone known in the church for the first fifteen hundred years. Christ is himself the *great Shepherd and Bishop of souls* (1 Pet. ii. 25), and the *head of all things to the church*, Ephes. i. 22. While he remained on earth, the apostles were presbyters; but before ascending to the Father, he said unto them, *As my Father hath sent me, so send I you*, John xx. 21. This was their commission; and he who took not that honour upon himself, but was sent of God, as was

Aaron (Heb. v. 4, 5), *breathed on them, and they received the Holy Ghost*, John xx. 22. The Jewish religion, then absorbed in the Gospel, was not of itself entirely dishonoured and forgotten. As there were twelve patriarchs and heads of tribes, so there were twelve apostles; and in the city of the New Jerusalem the names of the twelve tribe-chiefs were inscribed on the gates, and those of the twelve apostles on the foundation-stones, —*the church being built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone*, Ephes. ii. 20, Rev. xxi. 12, 14.

The apostles became bishops on the ascension of our Lord, and ordained bishops, priests, and deacons, in some resemblance to the chief-priests, priests, and Levites, under the law. Our Lord himself had set this example, in appointing the TWELVE apostles, and other *seventy* with inferior powers, a number corresponding to the seventy elders of Moses and the Sanhedrim. But neither, during their Master's incarnation, could commission or ordain other ministers; they were only to *pray the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth labourers into his harvest*, Matt. ix. 38. The appointment of Matthias in Judas' room manifested, not only the care taken to make up a number equal to that of the patriarchal tribe-chiefs, but farther shewed, by the step he took, that the apostles had then become bishops, or were possessed of power to ordain others to the ministry. It can be proved, that from this time there were three orders in the church,—bishops, who might ordain; priests, who consecrated the eucharist; and deacons, who could baptise, (and therefore were ecclesiastics) and perform the inferior ministrations of serving tables and dispensing the alms of the faithful. The *names* were not at first distinct, bishop and presbyter (or elder) being sometimes confounded,—for every bishop is a presbyter, although every presbyter is not a bishop,—and the bishop being sometimes called angel; but the episcopalians contend that the three *offices* were always distinct, and that the church was so governed for the first fifteen hundred years; *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*.

Paul had the care of *all the churches*, 2 Cor. 11-28. He called the elders of the church of Ephesus to Miletus—a mark

of superior authority, Acts xx. 17; and ordered his epistle to one church to be read in another—a proof of authority over both (Colos. iv. 16), as compliance and submission shewed an acknowledgment of that authority. John had authority over the seven churches, to the ministers of whom he writes; so that, whether we interpret the word “angel” as signifying bishop or presbyter, we find, *against* the Presbyterians, that there was a superior order and episcopal authority; and *against* the Independents, that one church held pre-eminence over and power of regulating another. Timothy was bishop in Ephesus, and appointed by St. Paul to ordain or confirm by the laying on of hands, in being commanded to *lay hands suddenly on no man*, either in ordaining or confirming, 1 Tim. v. 22. Titus was bishop of Crete, left there to ordain *presbyters* (the second order) in every city, Titus i. 5. In short, the principle of Episcopacy is here set forth,—that a man, by being ordained to the ministry, even to the priesthood, does not acquire the power of ordaining others.

The *priests*, the second order of the church, were capable of all ministerial acts, saving the imposition of hands in commissioning other priests; for that the Cretan ministers, who were already settled there, could not ordain or commission to the ministry, is clearly proved by the leaving of Titus in the island to discharge that function: *Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy or set apart priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ*. The priests in the Jewish Temple offered sacrifices, and had an inferior order beneath them—the Levites; and a superior order above them—one who could alone enter the holy of holies.

The *deacons* of the Gospel corresponded to the *Levites* of the law, and as such were ecclesiastics, performing ecclesiastical offices, such as baptising; for Philip the deacon baptised the Samaritans, Acts vi. 5, viii. 5, 12. The deacons were inferior to the apostles, and yet chosen by prayer, and laying on of hands, that they might divide the apostolic labour, by serving tables, Acts vi. 2-7. This office accorded with the appointment of the seventy by our Lord to herald his way, and with powers to heal the sick and cast out devils, Luke x. 9, 17; and this

conformably to the appointment of seventy elders under the law, Exod. xxiv. 1, Num. xi. 16, 24, 25. It accorded also with the subdivision of labour suggested by Jethro to Moses, Exod. xiii. 21, see Philip. i. 1. The character of a deacon is drawn in 1 Tim. iii. 8-14.

The Presbyterians claim divine authority for their church, and apostolical though not episcopal succession. They have a moderator in their assemblies and synods, but he is only a temporary chairman, and not of a different order, exercising a permanent jurisdiction. They admit of no order in the church superior to that of presbyter; and ordain by laying on of the hands of the presbytery, according to 1 Tim. iv. 14. They think all ambassadors of Christ equal in commission, and quote Titus i. 5, 7, with Acts xx. 28, in proof of the identity of bishops and presbyters in office: both texts making directly against them. Their ruling elders, who join in the church-government, are laymen; their deacons are also laymen, who stand at tables, at the church-door, keeping an eye on the voluntary system—a pewter plate, containing a mountain of mites and a sprinkling of half shekels, to be distributed in alms to the poor. They have a succession of courts, the lower having an appeal to the one above. The church-session is parochial, the presbytery is an assembly of a small number of parishes, the synod embraces several presbyteries, and from the synod there is an appeal to the general assembly, or annual convention of delegates from the synods. They admit not of the civil magistrate's interference with the spiritual concerns of their church, and judge in their own assemblies concerning the delinquencies of ministers. In this they are opposed to the Erastians, who deny that the church has a right to pass ecclesiastical censures, which, they think, belong to the civil magistrate.

The *Independents*, or *Congregationalists*, maintain that each congregation is a distinct church, unconnected with any other, and having power within itself to manage all the concerns of its religious government, being in no way subject or amenable to any other church. It is likewise their principle, that being independent of legislation, they are incapable of receiving provision or soliciting support from the state. They disallow the

authority of bishops, presbyters, or any ecclesiastical assembly whatever. How they can reconcile these notions with St. Paul's authority over the Corinthian church, *and the rest will I set in order when I come*, 1 Cor. xi. 34, see Titus i. 5; or with 1 Cor. xiv. 33, *for God is not the author of confusion, but of peace in all churches of the saints*; and ver. 40, *let all things be done decently and in order*; how such directions can be complied with, where there is no principle of order, no bond of unity, between one church and another, no superintending authority, we leave it to themselves to explain. As to the doctrine or morals of a pastor, his congregation are the sole and often ill-qualified judges, who will of course say, "Speak smooth things, and prophesy deceit; rather than probe our wounds, or shew that any thing is to be *done*." and if he presumes to dictate to an influential miser, or to touch the besetting sin of a rich prodigal, who pays liberally in hush-money; or if he remains till the fickle grow tired of him; nay, sometimes commits the unpardonable sin of marrying a wife,—he soon finds a storm raised about his ears. Independents! they are all independent but the minister, who must go about, cap in hand, to collect a support among his whole congregation: to the poor an exacter—to the rich a time-server—to all a sponge.

255. *Did the Hebrews break out into hymns of praise on any special manifestation of God's favour? Give the most ancient instances from the Old Testament. Is there any instance of remarkable similarity to one transmitted by St. Luke? Does the latter abound more in Hebraisms than the other parts of his Gospel? What inference do you draw as to these being genuine?*

There is much poetry in the Hebrew Scriptures, elevated in thought, figurative and glowing in style, and metrical, though we cannot precisely reduce the measure into technical rules. It abounds in parallelisms, many parts of it having been framed to be sung in the antiphonal manner, or to be more readily committed to memory; as were laws, proverbs, and effusions of praise after Divine deliverances or interpositions; such reduplications

being conformable to the genius of the people. The song of Moses, after the passage of the Red Sea, Exod. xv.; that of Balaam, after the victory gained by Israel over the Amorites, Num. xxiv.; and of Deborah and Barak, on the destruction of Jabin and Sisera, are hymns of praise, in the first order of poetry. The *magnificat*, or song of the blessed Mary, Luke i. 46-56, on the annunciation of the Holy One who should come, by immaculate conception, from her virgin womb, bears a remarkable likeness to the hymn of Hannah, after the removal of her barrenness, and the birth of Samuel. The song of Mary is in parallel but gradational couplets—the second, or responding clause, rising above the first in force, meaning, or emphasis; of which Bishop Lowth exhibits many instances in the Old Testament, and Bishop Jebb several in the New.

μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχὴ μου τὸν Κύριον,
καὶ ἡγαλλίασε τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρι μου.

Here *μεγαλύνει*, to magnify, rises into *ἡγαλλίασε*, denoting exultation; *ψυχὴ* is the animal soul, *πνεῦμα* the immortal spirit; *Κύριον* is the Lord of all, *τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρι μου* expresses the Divinity of the Saviour, or the God distinguished as bringing salvation. This is one Hebraism. The remaining sentences of the *magnificat* contain various antithetical parallels, which are terse improvements on those of the song of Hannah, and on other passages likewise abounding throughout the Old Testament. But the song of Mary contains other Hebraisms. 1. *He hath looked upon the humility of his servant*; for he hath favoured or succoured my humble condition; Gen. xvi. 11, 1 Sam. i. 11, Exod. iv. 31, 2 Sam. xvi. 12, Ps. xxv. 18. The *ἐπέβλεψεν* of Luke i. 48 is *ἐπήκουσε τῇ ταπείνῳ* in Gen. xvi. 11.—2. *Hath done to me great things, ἐποίησέ μοι μεγαλεῖα* (subaud. ἔργα), taken from Ps. lxxi. 19, Heb. מַלְאָכָא. This sense of *ποιέω* is a Hebraism throughout the passage.—3. *He that is mighty, ὁ δυνατός*; see Ps. xxiv. 8, where, however, *Κύριος* is prefixed.—4. *Holy is his name*, taken from Ps. cxi. 9. Here the name standing for the person is a Hebraism: to believe in the name of Christ is to believe in Christ as a Saviour.—5. *He hath shewed strength with his arm, ἐποίησε κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ*. The arm is the Hebrew symbol

of power; taken from Ps. xcvi. 1. A *finger*, spoken of as applied to God, intimates small power, Exod. xxxi. 18, Luke xi. 20; a *hand*, greater, John x. 29, Job xix. 21; an *arm*, the greatest, Exod. vi. 6.—6. *In remembrance of his mercy*; literally, *to remember his mercy*: God remembers his mercy when he is merciful; a Hebraism taken from Ps. xcvi. 4.—7. *From generation to generation*, εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν, is a Hebraism, signifying *to the latest generations*.

Mary, at once devout, versed in Scripture, and meek of disposition, adopts a song of inspiration from the song of a holy woman of old time, whose case resembled her own. It is a parody, however; seemingly suggested by memory, but condensed in expression, polished by refined taste, adorned with rich excerpts from other parts of Scripture, and beautifully accommodated to her difference of circumstances from those of Hannah. It is also a proof that she considered the situation of Hannah as both typical and prophetic of her own. Mary spoke the Syro-Chaldaic language; but long habits of acquaintance with the Old Testament furnish her with expressions agreeable to its parallelisms and other idioms. The whole is as one should expect it to be, and is therefore genuine—the true language of Mary's praise.

There are various other passages in the hymn of Mary, however, which shew an intimate acquaintance with the Old Testament; as 1 Sam. i. 11, compare Luke i. 48; Gen. xxx. 13, compare Luke i. 48; Ps. xciii. 3, compare Luke i. 54; Ps. ciii. 17, compare Luke i. 50 and Ps. cxviii. 1; Ps. cvii. 9, compare Luke i. 53; Micah vii. 20, compare Luke i. 55; and these passages have no resemblance to the song of Hannah. The whole indicates a mind deeply versed in the Scriptures, and inclined to take a form of prayer culled from the inspired volume, in preference to her own extemporaneous effusions.

256. *By what name is Ἡλίας commonly known? Compare his character, actions, and mode of life with those of John the Baptist.*

Elias is the prophet Elijah, and announced by Malachi (iv. 5) as to come on earth before the coming of the great day

of the Lord. The Jews, many of whom had gathered from the school of Alexandria some confused notions of a metempsychosis, construed this prophecy into a literal return of the prophet; and he did return in person before the destruction of Jerusalem in the transfiguration, though not for the purposes specified by Malachi; and though John denied himself to be the literal Elias, in order to dispel the erroneous or ambiguous construction above mentioned from the minds of the priests and Levites, yet our Lord, in various passages of the Gospel, declares that this John was the very Elias which was to come, Matt. xi. 14, xvii. 11, 12, Mark ix. 11-13; and the angel Gabriel explains the mystery to Zacharias, by saying that the Baptist should go before the Messiah, in the power and spirit of Elias, and for all the purposes which the prophet had foretold, Luke i. 17.

There were many points of resemblance between Elijah and John the Baptist. Both lived in times of difficulty; both were sent to reprove wicked princes, and spake to them fearlessly; both came to turn the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; both were meanly clad, and lived abstemiously; for Elias was a hairy man, and John had a garment of hair, 2 Kings i. 8, Zech. xiii. 14. Elijah and John alike wore a leathern girdle, 2 Kings i. 8, Mark i. 6, the quality of the girdle being still held in the East as the measure of wealth or poverty. Elijah was fed by ravens; and John lived on locusts and wild honey. Elijah, under the law, was the nearest forerunner of Christ in regard to his miraculous ascension; and John, in the gospel, his nearest forerunner with respect to his preternatural entrance upon earth. John baptised Christ, who came down from heaven; and Elijah ascended thither, nearly at the same spot, on the eastern bank of the Jordan.

257. In Mark xvi. 17 there is an express promise that miraculous powers should be imparted to them that believe. Are all Christians meant, or is the promise restricted? If so, to whom?

The miraculous gifts promised were, 1st, the casting out of devils; 2d, the speaking with new tongues; 3d, the taking up of serpents; 4th, the being uninjured by poison; and, 5th, heal-

ing the sick by imposition of hands. The casting out of devils is proved by the early Fathers, Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Irenæus, Tertullian, and by the seventy disciples on their return from their mission, Luke x. 17: the speaking with new tongues (Acts ii. 4, &c.), the Fathers confirm: the taking up of a serpent was manifested by St. Paul at Malta: and of the imbibing of a deadly poison without harm, Whitby cites four instances from history; the first being that of Barsabas, mentioned by Papias, who died A.D. 163. Ecclesiastical history is full of accounts of the healing of the sick by the first believers; even by the shadow of Peter passing by (Acts v. 15), or by handkerchiefs brought from the body of Paul, Acts xix. 12. We cannot doubt that all these miraculous powers were exercised by the apostles, as requisite to assist the early struggles of the Gospel amid all the opposition it encountered from Jewish prejudices, pagan priesthood, magisterial authority, philosophic scorn, and popular licentiousness. The gifted individuals would, of course, exercise a wise discretion in not interfering with the natural course of things save on urgent occasions. Such powers would be used as auxiliaries to the persuasion of preaching, and according to the measure of faith in the operator, as well as in the objects of each miracle; and they would gradually cease with, or soon after, the apostolic age; as props are withdrawn when the edifice can stand alone. The whole of the above-mentioned signs were not imparted to all the early preachers, for there were diversities of gifts and graces, 1 Cor. xii. 4. As the signs were intended to enforce the power of preaching, they could only be given to preachers, and not to all believers; nay, it was to those only who are mentioned in the fourteenth verse of Mark xvi., who had not at first believed them that had seen the Lord after his resurrection, but who had afterwards not only believed, but preached the resurrection. From the context in verse 14, and the parallel passages in Luke xxiv. 36-48 and John xx. 19, it appears that Christ, after his resurrection, was, on the occasion there mentioned, commissioning the eleven and other select disciples for their office, and giving them powers to execute their commission; Luke xxiv. 33, compared with chap. x. 1, 9, 17.

The rationalists say, that this whole passage is only a meta-

phorical way of saying, all obstacles should be removed from the moral success of the apostles; and they quote Luke x. 19, *Behold, I give you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall by any means hurt you*, as addressed by Christ to the seventy; and Ps. xci. 13, *Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder, the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under thy feet*, from which the preceding passage is probably taken.

But though the passage in St. Luke may, perhaps, be figurative, that in St. Mark is too precise and specific to admit of such construction.

258. *Ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῇτε τὸν υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον: what ellipsis is there in this passage, and what fact does it prove?*

The ellipsis is *τί ἐπεῖτε*. Some of his disciples had taken offence at our Lord's calling himself the bread which came down from heaven, by which, if a man should eat of it, he would live for ever. He answers, "When you shall behold my ascension into heaven, ye will no longer think it a hard saying, that I came down from heaven." This proves the pre-existence of Christ, and, coupled with the context, his body's being spiritually participated by faith in the Lord's supper.

259. *In John xxi. 18 is there any prophecy? and to what event does it allude?*

These words, addressed by our Saviour to Peter, after three times asking him whether he really loved his Master (in allusion, it is thought, to Peter's three denials), signified a contrast between the ease of his early fisherman's life, and the painful trials to which thenceforward his love and pastoral exertions would expose him. Crucifixion was announced, in which the apostle would have to stretch forth his hands to be nailed to the cross, and to be bound by the tormentors, and led, against his will, to the fatal tree.

260. *What do you consider to be the excellencies and defects of the plan in Paley's Natural Theology?*

Paley's *Natural Theology* consists in the happy evolution of a single, simple, obvious principle, viz. that the idea of a watch implies the idea of a watchmaker. This he has pursued throughout the whole of creation; and from a view of the elements of vegetable and animal nature, and of the structure of man, together with his relations to all these departments of created beings, and their mutual relation to each other, has silenced infidelity, and even doubt, with respect to his conclusion, that chance is out of the question in nature, and that a great, invisible, designing power must be admitted, at once wise and good, who hath made provision for every thing's answering the purposes of its being; while the proportions and accommodations he has settled between the different objects of creation evince a providence which gives wise laws to the universe. He has made theism a certainty, and atheism an impossibility. The whole is a series of plain, intelligible propositions, conveyed in the clearest language, and with the happiest powers of illustration. We are carried through courses of astronomy, mechanics, natural history, anatomy, and meteorology; and find every thing bearing upon his conclusions, and leading us to look through nature up to nature's God, who hath contrived every thing for the happiness of his creatures.

Such appears to be a brief sketch of the excellencies of Paley's *Natural Theology*; and as revealed religion supposes and embraces all the truths of natural religion, it may be considered as an elementary lecture in divinity—the vestibule of the temple of inspiration—the porch leading the inquiring mind into the deeper mysteries of revealed truth.

In this work, however, we cannot fail, though without capriciousness, to discern several defects. 1. Paley has burnished and certainly improved the armour of Ray and Derham, from whom he withholds due credit for having opened the path of investigation. He has been equally unjust in his *Evidences* to Lardner, Doddridge, and Sherlock. Whatever he is, they, in a great measure, made him.

2. Again, it would have been more satisfactory, more to the credit of his personal belief as a Christian, had his *Natural Theology* been his first work, and his *Evidences* his second. This would have shewn his sense of the necessity for revelation to supply the insufficiency of reason in divine things. By inverting this rule, he conveys the impression of his dissatisfaction with his first conclusions, and his falling back on natural theology as the higher certainty of the two systems. May not this order of publication produce the effect we speak of in the minds of speculative philosophers, establishing deism, to the slighting of Christianity?

3. *Can* the unity of God be demonstrated by natural theology? If so, how did so many intelligent nations wander so widely from the discovery? Whence the Pantheon of idolatry? and why was not this unity taught and enforced by those who had the authority and guidance of public opinion in Greece and Rome? *Suppose* a plurality of Gods; and might not one among the many invent some wise design in creation and government, which all the others might copy?—so that mere uniformity of plan may not *indisputably prove the unity* of God. Or are there not appearances in the universe of a good designing power and an evil designing power? As to the philosophers, who soared above the multitude, and may have been suffered to make the discoveries which Paley calls so obvious, some of them owned a fate which tied up their deity—a God above God; some deemed this deity the living soul of nature—unity without intelligence; while others held another *divisum imperium*, by admitting chance into the universe, and deeming the common concerns of men too trifling to disturb the enjoyment of their far-off divinities.

4. Paley's system may clearly enough make out a *general* Providence, but it is lamentably deficient in proving particular superintendence. It only makes out a power which regulates matters on a large scale, and preserves the species, but neglects the individual; a power which establishes general laws, and leaves them, like machinery, to their own working, without the least seeming regard to individual cases.

5. In proving the wisdom of God in contriving, and his benevolence in arranging much for the happiness of his crea-

tures, Paley has indeed shewn, that by following up his plan, we may, in great measure, secure a larger sum of happiness than most men on earth enjoy ; but he has altogether overlooked the *origin of evil*, not merely of that evil which man produces by his imprudence, but of that which is unavoidable. He has failed to shew how earthquakes, shipwrecks, storms, conflagrations, pestilences, and famines, in which the good and wicked, the prudent and the imprudent, suffer indiscriminately, comport with all this wisdom and benevolence. He has failed to explain why, throughout the whole animal creation, from the lion to the mite, from leviathan to the minnow, there is one universal system of oppression, plunder, cruelty, pain, and murder ; why some are formed with tusks and talons, to tear their living prey, and some are only born to drop into the jaws of these destroyers. He has, indeed, shewn that God has taken pains to implant two instincts, — the desire for food, and the propagation of the species ; but why are so many eggs destroyed, the rudiments of living creatures ; and why are the young of animals and vegetables more delicious, and often more wholesome food, than if they had accomplished their full growth, short as their term of life is at the longest ? Why do so many children die in infancy ? If all this be following up a wise and beneficent design, might not the sceptic, *on the principles of natural theology*, object that it was the most unaccountable waste of wisdom, and perversion of beneficence, he had ever heard of or could conceive ?

6. And this leads us to another striking defect in Paley's system, which is, that in considering creation as bearing so many marks of wisdom and benevolence in contrivance, he has fixed his attention on the present life, and not, or very slightly, taken futurity into his account. It may be said, that this was his only choice as to the *inferior animals*. But while he has shewn that their organisation and instincts tend to enjoyment in the present life, and shew wisdom in the contrivance, he has lamentably failed in shewing wisdom or benevolence in the practical and necessarily unavoidable state of facts, and in inferring, what he might have inferred, that God intends them a compensation in another state. Would a hack-horse or a beaten donkey have chosen existence, or be thankful for it, if it should know that it

was to have no Sabbath in its miseries, here or hereafter? As to *man*, Paley shews his having been made and fashioned by wisdom for enjoyment in the present life; though the complaint of his being born to trouble is as old as king David, and the experience as universal as the light of day. Man has not been sufficiently considered as a probationary being, nor this world, in regard to him, as a state of probation.

7. Paley's demonstration of the goodness of God, as proved by natural theology, is necessarily unsatisfactory, as the proof cannot be made out without including a future state. That this life is a state of happiness, is neither a fact nor the design of Providence. Not even virtue makes it so; and Dr. Johnson points attention to what virtue has suffered, and even to what it has incurred. But Paley might have extended his speculations in natural theology, as other writers have done, to the proofs or probabilities which it affords of a future state. Other writers have inferred this, from the *miseries* endured here, and the present inequalities of the Divine dispensations; and they have pronounced a future life to be a *necessary compensation*. On this argument of natural theology we shall only observe, that while it forgets our moral delinquencies, it assumes our moral *deserts*, and tends to universalism, seeming to shew that all men have a *claim* to eternal life from the *justice* of God, — which is bad divinity, and worse self-knowledge. A future state of retribution must be called in, to make the argument unanswerable. Now, Paley probably saw that the argument for a *compensation*, drawn from present suffering and the brevity of life, abstractedly taken, besides injuring his proofs of wisdom and benevolence, as drawn exclusively from present appearances, would embrace the wicked, and even the lower animals (at present sufferers); and therefore he prudently waived the question. But the fear of an hereafter is a salutary check to the *wicked*, and the means of avoiding it are in their hands. And although its *certainty* is only proved in its being *brought to light* by the Gospel, its extreme probability with respect to man might be shewn, 1st, from the notion of it, which is one of his instincts; 2d, from the prediction of his conscience; and, 3d, from his capabilities of infinite progression in intellectual and moral improvement. These might

be proved on principles of natural religion ; and Paley's work is defective in passing the subject over almost unnoticed.

The difficulties with respect to the lower animals, however, are far greater ; for with them we must return to the principle of *compensation*. Paley, in his eagerness to prove the beneficence of the Deity, as displayed in the happiness of created beings, sometimes outsteps the bounds of his own argument. "I was walking," says he, "one fine summer evening, on the sea shore, and descried a vast number of small animals leaping and bounding on the sand, and thus manifesting the exuberance of their *joy*." These were marine animals left by the retiring wave, and all their bounding was the result, not of joy, as he says, but of uneasiness and fear, seeking to get back to their own element, and having a natural dread of death. That death should be painful to *man*, is a difficulty easily solved, because it is the last penalty of the good man's sin, and will be forgotten, even on the principles of natural religion, in the reversion of happiness hereafter ; while it may be, likewise, the commencement of the punishment of the wicked. But why should suffering and painful death befall the *lower animals*, who are ignorant of sin or virtue ? Are *they* to have a compensation hereafter ? Many eminent and pious men, such as Butler, Wesley, Cudworth, Hartley, have inclined to the affirmative ; and Pope asked, on the question of their future living, "Where would be the harm if they should ?" Their numbers and insignificance are no reply to any probability of their living hereafter ; for how came they *here* ? If the lower animals, without personal offence, without participation in the guilt of man, participate in the death and other evils occasioned by the fall, would not justice seem to require that they should participate in the remedy for these evils ? On the other hand, however, so far as we know, *they* have no *notion* of hereafter—no anticipation of conscience—no capabilities of progression : they follow their instincts here, and know nothing of restraint, on any other principle than that of the fear of man. Thus the absence of moral agency would seem to render them incapable of future recompense. At once innocent and unhappy here, then, how can their annihilation be reconciled to the *goodness* of God ? Some notice of this diffi-

culty might have been expected from Archdeacon Paley, on principles of natural theology. See Buckland's sermon on the question, whether, before the fall of man, the lower animals were subject to death: a lame attempt to reconcile the pretended ante-Mosaic cosmogony to revelation.

261. *What were the characteristics of the Gnostic, Manichæan, and Pelagian heresies?*

The principles of the *Gnostics* existed before the introduction of Christianity; but by incorporating their philosophy with revelation, they introduced the first seeds of the Arian heresy. They considered that the supreme God inhabited the *pleroma* from all eternity, but, as all matter was evil, that he could not have formed it. They held that he produced two other beings, from whom proceeded a variety of *æons*, emanations, or inferior beings, one of whom passed the *pleroma*, and came in contact with matter, which he moulded into the frame of the world. This being they call the *demiurgus*, as distinct from the supreme God, and a rebel against him. Thus good and evil were continually at strife with one another. Jesus Christ they held to be one of the *æons*, sent to give good the preponderance, and to remedy the evil which the *demiurgus* had created, by emancipating man from the tyranny of matter, or the evil principle. Christ revealed the true God, and this was the sublimity of knowledge. Christ could have no real connexion with matter, any more than the God who sent him: they therefore concluded, either that he was a phantom, and had no real body, or that the *æon* Christ descended upon the man Jesus at his baptism. He was, thus, neither the God of the Old Testament, nor divine in any sense; and the abhorrence of the Gnostics to matter taught them to deny the resurrection, as matter in no form could enter into heaven. A resurrection, then, and a final judgment, were both unnecessary. Hence some Gnostics led profligate lives, casting the blame or account upon matter, as part of their present being; while they despised the injunctions of the Mosaic law, as not given by the supreme God. Others passed their days in the strictest asceticism, considering it to be their duty to keep the body, as consisting of matter, under subjection; and think-

ing, that by emancipating themselves from its dominion, they passed into participation of the inheritance of the divine pleroma. They called Christ the λόγος, an emanation from the supreme God, who first came to reveal him, and to impart the true knowledge of him. John, who wrote his Gospel in opposition to them, begins by saying, that this λόγος was in the beginning with God, and was God, and the Creator of all things: and in reply to their notion of his being an unsubstantial phantom, he writes, in his first Epistle, *that which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life—(for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us),—that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you*, 1 John i. 1, 2, 3. The Magians, or disciples of Simon Magus, the Cerinthians, Ebionites, and Nicolaitans, were different ramifications of the Gnostic heresy. The latter were those who were the most profligate, and the infection of whose errors had reached the church of Pergamos, laying it open to the censure and denunciation of St. John, Rev. ii. 15.

It seems astonishing that the Gnostics, thinking matter to be an evil, and an evil to be suppressed by elevating spirit to dominion over it, should, from such premises, come to a conclusion of practical sensuality. But the human heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.

The *Manichæans* were the disciples of Manes, a Persian, and a sect of the third century; who followed in the track of the Gnostics and Marcionites in believing two eternal first principles, *the one evil, and the other good*. They rejected the Old Testament; held Christ to be an appearance; and Manes to be the Paraclete whom he promised—not the Holy Ghost, but an apostle through whom the Holy Ghost should make a clearer revelation. This last error (the expectation of another Paraclete not revealed in Scripture) seems to have been at the root of the systems of Manes, Mahomet, and other more ignorant impostors, such as Joanna Southcote.

With respect to the notion of two eternal first principles, one

good and the other evil, it was derived from the ancient Magi of Persia, who called these principles *Ormuzd* and *Akraman*, and worshipped fire, or light, as the symbol of the former, darkness being that of the evil god. In condemnation of these principles, Isaiah introduced God saying to Cyrus, *I am the Lord, and there is none else; I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil: I the Lord do all these things*, Isa. xlv. 7 (B.C. 768). And it is thought that these words of the prophet suggested to Zerdusht, or Zoroaster, who reformed the Magian religion, the idea of a supreme God, superior to both the good and evil power (B.C. 522). From the principles of Zoroaster, and his pretending to bring sacred fire from heaven, Prideaux conceives him to have been educated in Judea. The worst part of that ancient religion of the Magi gave rise to the different sects of Gnostics, who likewise derived much from the new Platonists. Prideaux, *Connexion*, vol. i. p. 301; Burton's *Eccles. Hist.* 2d cent.

The *Pelagians* arose in the early part of the fifth century, A.D. 405, being the disciples of Pelagius, a Welshman named Morgan, a word signifying *an inhabitant of the sea-shore*, and Grecised into the similar appellative Pelagius. Offended at the extreme to which some divines had carried the doctrines of original sin and grace, the depravation by the one being considered as so entire as to make the other necessarily overwhelming, and to preclude human co-operation in the work of conversion,—Pelagius, in the opposite excess, denied wholly original sin, or native and inherited corruption, and affirmed the possibility of obedience without the influence of God's Holy Spirit; denying inward spiritual impulses to be the *sole* agents in moral conduct, though he acknowledged as outward grace the motives of the Gospel. He admitted a derived influence from God in prompting and aiding obedience: he denied death, however, to be the punishment of the sin of Adam; and stated, that the *direction* of any power to repent which may be imparted by God, depends on the *free-will* of man. If Augustine had not carried the opposite doctrines, which make man a *machine* blindly and irresistibly impelled by grace, too far, it is probable that Pelagianism would never have been broached or heard of. By the influence of

Augustine, the synod of Carthage condemned Pelagianism, in A.D. 412.

The Calvinists in the church brand the orthodox as *Pelagians*; who retort the charge by terming their opponents *antinomians* and *necessitarians*. Both, perhaps, direct their attack to the opposite *principles*, but not to their practical application. They speak of the ray, but not of the medium by which it is inflected. The *orthodox* allow that they can do nothing but by the grace of God; the Calvinists affirm, that whom God justifieth he sanctifieth. Thus both save themselves from the conclusions which their adversaries would fasten on their principles.

262. Polycarp, Origen, and Tertullian.

These were three fathers of the Christian church; the two former of the second, and the latter of the third century.

POLYCARP was bishop of Smyrna, a disciple of St. John, and by him consecrated. He defended his church against the attacks both of Jews and heathens, the former of whom John calls *the synagogue of Satan*. From the vicinity of Smyrna to Ephesus, the last of the apostles must have had frequent intercourse with his disciple, whose martyrdom he seems to have foretold in Rev. ii. 10, *Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life*. Polycarp was born in the reign of Nero, and must have lived many years with several of the apostles. He wrote an Epistle to the Philippians, a translation of which has been preserved by Dr. Cave, A.D. 107. He visited Rome during the controversy between the Eastern and Western churches respecting the time of observing Easter; the former to this day observing that festival on the next Lord's day after the Jewish pass-over, and the latter on the Sunday after the first full moon which follows the vernal equinox — an immaterial point in itself, but deriving its importance from being a symbol of Judaising, or mark of entire conversion from the religion of rites. Polycarp passing Marcion in the streets of Rome, that heretic called to him, "Polycarp, own us." "I do own thee," replied he, "to be the first-born of Satan;" an answer, he added afterwards, suggested by a speech of St. John, who, seeing Cerinthus in a bath, retired, exclaiming, "Let us run away, lest the building

fall and crush us while that enemy of truth is in it." Polycarp left Rome about A.D. 158, and returned to Smyrna, where he suffered martyrdom in a persecution of the Christians under Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 167), when nearly ninety years of age. Having dreamt that his pillow took fire, he conceived the dream to be a presage of his being burnt alive; and three days afterwards, when he might have escaped, met his fate with, "The will of the Lord be done." On being called upon to recant, and to say, "Take away the impious," he looked on the multitude, and, waving his hand, cried in a stern voice, and altered meaning from its intended sense, "Take away the impious!" His Epistle to the Philippians, written seven years after St. John's death, and which Jerome says was, even in his time, read in many Asiatic churches, is almost composed of phrases from the New Testament; and as he quotes Matthew, Luke, the Acts, St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Ephesians, 1 Timothy, 1 Peter, and 1 John, he proves the genuineness and authenticity of these books as existing in the first century. Burton's *Early Church*, p. 209; Evans's *Biography of Early Church*, art. Polycarp; Jortin on *Eccles. Hist.*; Lardner.

ORIGEN was born in Alexandria, A.D. 158. Deeply instructed from a child in the holy Scriptures, his peculiar turn of mind led him to search them for recondite meanings; a *furor allegoricus*, which, blended with the Platonic philosophy, proved the occasion of much error. His father being imprisoned during the persecution of the Christians, A.D. 202, Origen, then a youth of seventeen, was eager to offer himself for martyrdom; and his mother hiding his clothes to prevent his going out, he wrote a letter to his father, saying, "Stand steadfast, and let no regard for your family shake your resolutions;" which encouraged his father to endure his fate. He was beheaded, and his goods confiscated, whereby the family was reduced to extreme poverty; which Origen relieved by teaching grammar. On the retirement of Clement, his master, from the school of sacred learning in Alexandria, the bishop of that city ordained Origen, then only eighteen, as catechist; and he immediately sold all his books of profane learning, living on four oboli a-day, granted him by the

purchaser. A persecution arising, several of his disciples suffered martyrdom; and he exposed himself to heathen rage, by visiting them in prison and attending them to the stake. He now practised all kinds of austerities; and even committed an act of self-mutilation which obviated temptation and silenced the tongue of slander, to which his youth was exposed in its ministrations. Of this he was afterwards ashamed, regretting his literal interpretation of Matt. xix. 12, which he ought at least to have qualified by 1 Cor. vii. 2, 9, Heb. xiii. 4, Ephes. v. 23-30, since a spiritual mortification is alone required. In Caracalla's reign he began his *Tetrapla* and *Hexapla*, the latter of which was a collection, in columns, of six different versions of the Old Testament; the Hebrew text being set beside the Hebrew written in Greek (the best guide to the Hebrew pronunciation, either with or without points); and the Septuagint, with the three translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. He was sent for by princes, bishops, and others, to instruct them; but was not ordained priest before A.D. 228, after which he published commentaries on different books of the Old and New Testaments, although persecuted by the bishop of Alexandria, in envy of his ordination by the bishop of Jerusalem. His life during the sixth and seventh persecutions of the Christians, A.D. 236 and 250, was sufficiently disturbed; yet he assailed several heresies, by proving the pre-existence of Christ; and combated the materialist notion, that souls die and revive again with their bodies, affirming that the soul survives the dissolution of the body in an intermediate state. In the seventh persecution, under Decius, he was stretched on the rack; and yet, though now old, continued preaching, writing, and holding controversies, with all the vigour of youth. He at length died at Tyre, in his seventieth year, A.D. 254.

Jerome asks—who can read so many books as he composed? But many of these have perished. Two volumes folio of fragments and remains of his *Hexapla* are preserved by Montfaucon, and his surviving works are extant in several editions. His learning and industry, during a long life, were extraordinary; but his peculiar dogmas created many divisions after his death. His luxuriant fancy led him too far into the intricacies of allegory. He attempted to compare the

Trinity to the sun with its light and heat (that is, the dangerous experiment of reducing a mystery to comprehensibility); and was thus led to think the second and third Persons inferior both in time and dignity to the first. Thus inclined to Arianism, he had a crochet of universalism, which gave to the stars a rational soul, and inferred, that with men, angels, and devils, they shared the benefits of the death of Christ. To this he added a touch of Brahminical metempsychosis, thinking that the same soul may successively pass through all changes of created being, punished or rewarded in each according to its behaviour in the preceding tenements; while all shall, at length, return to their original state of pure intelligence, but only to begin again the same round. He believed, with the Platonists, a pre-existent state of the human soul, as necessary to its nature; and he held the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ. He turned every thing, even the Law and the Gospel, into allegory; and in this sense, though not in his heterodoxical opinions, was afterwards imitated by the modern Hutchinsonians. Mirandula was censured by the divines of his time for saying, it is more probable that Origen was saved than damned; and Bellarmine, in a controversy, proposes, at a mock trial, that the whole party should descend into hell, that he might shew them Origen, and settle the point at once. But there is reason to believe that his writings have been interpolated and corrupted, and that much is laid unjustly to his charge by the heat and malignity of controversy. Eusebius was his advocate on all occasions. Jerome at first exalted, but afterwards reviled him, though allowing him to be *magnus vir ab infantia*. Erasmus, at a later period, says, "Plus me docet Christianæ fidei unica Origenis pagina, quam decem Augustini."

TERTULLIAN, the earliest of the Latin fathers, was born in Carthage about the middle of the second century, and passed his youth, like Augustine, in debauchery and profligacy; but after his conversion went to an opposite severity, and adopted the principles of Montanus, by preaching the extreme of mortification. He flourished between A.D. 194 and A.D. 216, during the reigns of Severus and Caracalla; and Jerome thinks that he lived to a decrepit old age. Montanus, however, was an enemy

to marriage, and Tertullian, though a priest, was a married man. He bears a high reputation among the fathers for learning and eloquence; and when Cyprian's secretary asked him what books he would have to read, that father replied, "Give me my master." Others of the fathers accord to Tertullian the praise of erudition and acuteness, but some deny him that of eloquence. "His words," says Vincentius Lirinensis, "are sentences; his answers in controversy, victories." Among the moderns, Malebranche, in extolling the power of imagination, cites Tertullian as an example of the power of persuading without reason; one whose understanding was weak; whose arguments were pompous; whose figures hyperbolical; and who is obscure without being brief. Balzac compares this father to polished ebony, dark, but neatly wrought; and to an African beauty, eclipsing Italian ladies; who wielded a style of iron, forged into excellent weapons. Cave praises him for a difficult eloquence: "quæ simul legentis ingenium exercet, et animum suavitæ delectat." See *Manual of Sects of Early Church*; Evans's *Biography*; Cave; Burton's *Early Church*.

Tertullian's works shew an acquaintance with the historians, orators, poets, philosophers, and even the lawyers and physicians of antiquity. He wrote an *Apology for Christianity*, A.D. 205, and other treatises; that entitled *De Pallio* bearing a print of Salmasius the editor. He wrote against the Gnostics. His *Apology* paints the extreme sufferings of the martyrs in vivid colours. His impetuous temper, which plunged him in vice in early life, drove him to take delight in the sharpest and bitterest invectives against what had at first decoyed him, after his conversion. He kept no terms with the least ostentation, pomp, or vanity. Affluence was a crime; and prudence, seeking safety from martyrdom in flight, was cowardice—contrary to Matt. xxiv. 16, Mark xiii. 14, and Luke xxi. 1. He held, that no penance or penitence would admit certain offenders into the church, or into the state of salvation they had forfeited. He was inveterate against all public shows, which he describes with the pruriency of an unhallowed imagination. He peoples hell with kings, priests, and actors; and has laid the Gospel open to the invectives of Gibbon.

263. *Translate into Greek, from the English version, John xii. 28, 29. Explain on what notion the remark of the multitude was founded. Was there a similar notion among the heathen?*

Πάτερ, δόξασον τὸ ὄνομά σου· τότε ἦλθεν ἡ φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰποῦσα, Ἐδόξασα, καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω. Οἱ ὄχλοι οὖν περιστάντες καὶ ἀκούσαντες εἶπον, ὅτι ἐβρόντησεν· ἄλλοι δέ, ὅτι ἄγγελος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλάλησεν.

The voice was a distinct verbal utterance to those who were near, as is clear from verse 30; but some, who may have been at a distance, or not attentive, attributed it to thunder, for it appears that thunder sometimes accompanied such communications: as in Exod. xix. 16-19, *and there were thunders and lightnings, and the voice of a trumpet; and Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice*; and Rev. iv. 5, viii. 5, xvi. 18, *and out of the throne proceeded lightnings and thunders and voices*. But others of the crowd, who heard the articulate sounds, supposed that God had spoken to Jesus by an angel, the Jews conceiving that God always communicated with his creatures by the ministry of angels. Elsner, Doddridge, Pearce, Bloomfield, &c., think, with probability, that thunder accompanied the voice. The Hebrews, with other ancient nations, considered thunder and lightning to be the voice of God, which they interpreted according to their reason or fancy, and hence was raised their notion of *בר קהל*. Jupiter, to whom the dominion of the firmament was committed, was called by the Greeks *βρονταῖος*, and by the Latins *altitonans*. He grasps a thunderbolt; and thunder was either deemed to be his voice or the accompaniment of his voice.

Da deinde auxilium, pater, atque hæc omnia firma.

Vix ea fatus erat senior, subitoque fragore

Intonuit lævum.

Æn. lib. ii. c. 689.

Ζεῦ πάτερ,

Ἡ μέγαλ' ἐβροντήσας ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος.

Odys. lib. xx. l. 112.

264. *Which of the following are Roman, and which Jewish customs: 1. the scourging of our Lord; 2. the bearing the cross; 3. the manner of his death; 4. the place of execution; 5. his burial after execution as a criminal; 6. the embalming of his body?*

1. *Scourging* was a *Jewish* custom, Deut. xxv. 1-3; and in order to keep within the prescribed forty stripes, they inflicted thirteen stripes with a whip formed of three cords, in all thirty-nine; 2 Cor. xi. 24.

2. The *cross*, σταυρός, had its name from σταυρώω, to fix, as the tree or upright column was fixed at the place of punishment; and to bear the cross was confined to the transverse beam, under which our Saviour sank. "Lignum transversum solum portavit Jesus (scilicet patibulum) ad locum ubi crux (scilicet lignum oblongum) terra defixum stetit." Lipsius. The bearing of the cross was typified by Isaac's carrying the wood for his own sacrifice. Was Matt. xvi. 24 a prophecy,—*If any man will come after me, let him take up his cross and follow me?* Simon the Cyrenian was compelled to carry one end of the cross. This sense is alluded to in 1 Tim. vi. 2, τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀνταλαμβάνόμενοι, *partakers of the benefit*; and in Luke xxiii. 26 we read, σταυρὸν φέρειν ὀπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

3. *Crucifixion* was a *Roman* punishment, inflicted only on slaves, and not mentioned in the Old Testament; consequently the accessories of it, as bearing the cross, &c., must have been likewise Roman. As to the punishment of our Lord, it seems to have been pointed out by the prophet, *And he (the Lord our God) shall spread forth his hands in the midst of them, as he that swimmeth spreadeth forth his hands to swim*, Isa. xxv. 11. But wherever hanging is mentioned in the Bible, it means suspension alone.

It was a Roman custom also to administer to criminals about to suffer torture a bowl of wine mixed with a grain of frankincense, and called by St. Mark οἶνον ἐσμυρισμένον, *myrrhed wine*; but by St. Matthew ὄξος μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον, *vinegar mingled with gall*. Myrrh, Hebrew מִרְיָא, was a principal ingredient in these compositions, and χολή is frequently used as the transla-

tion of wormwood by the Septuagint, Prov. v. 14, Lam. iii. 15. But *χολή*, like *πικρία*, is a general word, signifying either *gall* or *wormwood*, or *any thing bitter*, not only in a literal, but in a figurative sense: *χολή καὶ πικρία*, Sept. *as gall and wormwood*, Lam. iii. 15; *רָלְזָא פִּיקְרִיָּא*, מֵרֹרֶת (*merorath*), Deut. xxix. 18, Heb. xii. 15. *Bitterness* is rendered *gall* in Job xvi. 13, xx. 14, Ruth i. 20. *Call me not Naomi* (i.e. *pleasant*), *but call me Mara* (or *bitter*); *for the Almighty hath dealt very bitterly with me*. May it not be concluded, that the prophecy in Psalm lxix. 20 is partly metaphorical—like *bread of affliction*, Is. xxx. 20,—and signifies the cruel reproaches with which even an act of kindness was mixed? for this wine, mixed with myrrh and other drugs, was given by the Roman soldiers in humanity, to produce stupefaction and insensibility. *And they gave me gall to drink*, may allude metaphorically to the mockings of the Jews. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* tom. xiv. ch. 13; Athen. tom. xi. cap. 30. Some commentators think, with much probability, that an opiate was mixed with the vinegar, *ὄξος*, or light and acid wine, called by the Romans *posca*, and the common beverage of the Roman soldiers. It was not unknown to the Jews: Boaz desired Ruth to dip her morsel in the vinegar, Ruth ii. 14, *ἐν τῷ ὄξει*, Sept.

4. The *place of execution*, beyond the walls of the city, was *Jewish*. *The flesh of the bullock shalt thou burn without the camp—it is a sin-offering*, Exod. xxix. 14: and hence, in a spiritual sense, arises the Christian duty of renouncing a sinful world. *For the bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high-priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth, therefore, unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach; for here we have no continuing city*, Heb. xiii. 11-14.

Some other circumstances in the manner of Christ's death refer to Roman customs, and yet accomplish Jewish prophecies. As crucifixion was a lingering death, it was sometimes accelerated by breaking the legs of the sufferers. This was practised by the Jews in despatching the two thieves; as no dead body, by the Jewish law, was suffered to remain upon the tree beyond sunset, Deut. xxi. 22, 23. But Jesus being dead, and having

been proved to be so by the spear-wound, out of which issued water and blood—a physical indication of his death, as it was an emblem of the commencement and close of his public ministry (see Grant's *Sermons*, vol. ii. p. 164),—they brake not his legs; so that the Scripture was unwittingly fulfilled which said, *a bone of the paschal lamb shall not be broken*, Exod. xii. 46, Num. ix. 12, John xix. 36, Ps. xxxiv. 20.

5. The *Romans* did not inter the bodies of crucified persons, but sometimes gave them to their friends, on application, for burial. Thus Pilate would more readily grant the request of Joseph of Arimathea, as it would be a courtesy, and chiefly to those disciples among whom his condemnation of Jesus had rendered him unpopular.

Thus was Christ executed by the Romans as a criminal; numbered with malefactors; exempt from the usual treatment of criminals, which was often to remain on the cross till the birds of prey devoured their carcases; and thus did he fulfil another prophecy, by *making his grave with the rich in his death*, *because he had done no violence*, Isa. liii. 9.

6. The *embalming* of the body of Jesus was a *Jewish* custom, borrowed from Egypt, as we find in the cases of Jacob and Joseph, Gen. i. 2, 26. The ancient Romans usually burned their dead bodies, although they sometimes previously embalmed them; but embalming, in order to preserve the body, was not introduced into Europe before the Christian era. The Egyptian embalming was a tedious process, and very costly. It required thirty days of applying drugs, and forty days of laying in salt of nitre, before it was finally swathed. The brains and bowels were likewise extracted. The highest expense was a talent, or 300*l.*, but other embalming was considerably cheaper. That practised by the Jews was evidently intended to preserve the body from offensive putrefaction until it should be interred, and probably a little while after it had lain in the cave or sepulchre. Joseph only laid the body of Jesus in his tomb, wrapt in a clean linen cloth, Matt. xxvii. 59, 60; and it was the Marys and Salome that brought the sweet spices and ointment to anoint him, by way of honour; as the woman who brake her alabaster-box had done before his death, and as some say the Magi had done, by

their offering of myrrh in prophetic anticipation, even at his birth. Nicodemus, indeed, had previously brought an hundred pound weight of myrrh and aloes, but this must have been unknown to the women, and could only serve for the purposes of honour, and of furnishing an inferior antiseptic, whose effects could not be so permanent as those of a regular embalming. So, likewise, Lazarus was wrapt in grave-clothes, and probably anointed and perfumed, that his body might be preserved from offensiveness during the first days of the grief of relations, should they go to the grave and weep there; John xi. 31. That it was no permanent embalming (like that of a mummy) appears from the words of Martha, *Lord, by this time he smelleth, for he has been dead four days*, John xi. 39.

265. *When was the testimony alluded to in John i. 15 given?*

When John was baptising in Bethabara beyond Jordan, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, *Who art thou?* This happened the day before the baptism of Jesus. It is singular that St. John here refers to a fact which he records, not before, but subsequently to the reference, which shews that his Gospel was a gleaning after the narratives of the other evangelists, and in many respects rather a controversial disputation than a history.

266. 1 Cor. iii. 10-16 *has been adduced by Roman Catholics as a proof of the fire of purgatory. Shew the fallacy of any such reasoning from the passage quoted.*

St. Paul is in this chapter reproving the Corinthian disciples for their internal divisions respecting their spiritual teachers; and in the passage under consideration, he represents these teachers under the figure of builders of one temple on a common foundation, Christ; that is, the Christian religion, or its elementary truths, other foundation than which no man can lay. But let every man, says he, see how he rears the superstructure—what doctrine he raises on the first elements; for there may be good doctrine—gold, silver, precious stones; and bad doctrine—wood, hay, and stubble: that is, probably, on the one hand, the

vital truths and important details of Christianity; or, on the other, vain subtleties, legal rites, and Jewish traditions. The event will shew which of these doctrines is substantial; and that event is supposed by some commentators to be the day of judgment, when the heavens and earth shall be consumed. Pursuing the metaphor of a building, the fire shall try the solidity of the building. As gold is insoluble by fire, the pure doctrine will stand firm against the shocks of life, and form a truly Christian character; tried in the furnace of suffering, it will fall into the crucible purified from its dross; while the uncertain and unprofitable doctrine will vanish away, and produce no good results; as buildings of wood, hay, and stubble, are easily consumed.

Grotius says, "Si quis doctor præcepta specialia dederit, quæ, considerata re, loco, tempore, circumstantiis, convenient cum Christi generalibus præceptis, in honorem apud ecclesias omnes consequetur." "Incendio igitur respondet lux, quæ ab ecclesiis omnibus, uni ecclesiæ laboranti allucet. Sic Dei judicia igni comparantur Esaïæ iv. 4, lxvi. 16. Spiritus ecclesiæ primum in ignis forma datus." But if the edifice erected shall yield to the flames; if a teacher mix up philosophical speculations—the hay of human wisdom, the stubble of verbose eloquence—with his preaching, he shall suffer loss; *ζημιωθήσεται, be mulcted* (a law-term), *but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.* It is evident that the apostle is speaking of teachers only, and not of Christians in general; and, retaining the metaphor of the house in flames, he says that the teacher of vanities shall lose his labour, and with difficulty be saved himself. If, on the whole, building on Christ, he shall have an inferior reward to the preachers of the Gospel in its purity.

The twofold error of the Roman Catholics is that of transferring the metaphorical fire of the house to the fire of purgatory, and that which is said of the erroneous embellishments of unwise teachers to the moral delinquencies of all Christians. The *figmentum papisticum* of purgatory, says Elsner, is derived from the dregs of rabbinical nonsense and absurdity. It has no countenance from the early fathers, and the later ones tried to interpolate τοῦτο πῦρ πιστεύομεν καθαρτήριον, ἐν ᾧ καθαρίζονται αἱ ψυχαί, ὡς χρυσίον ἐν πυρὶ χωνευτηρίῳ. *Recensio Synopt.* in loc.

Whitby assigns three solid reasons against the application of this passage to purgatorial fire: 1. Because the fire the apostle speaks of, as Origen hath noted (*contr. Celsum*, ch. iv. p. 168), is not *πῦρ ἱλικόν καὶ αἰσθητόν*, ἀλλὰ τροπολογικόν, as is plain from the words, *he shall escape* (not *by*, but) *as by fire*. 2. Because this fire is to try *every man's* work — that of Paul and Apollos even; and they will not place Paul and Apollos in purgatory. 3. This fire is to try every man's work, *of what sort it is*; but purgatory makes no fiery *trial* of this inquisitorial kind, but punishes for the evil work known to have been committed.

Besides, the words *ὥς διὰ πυρός* signify *saved as out of the fire*; bearing the same sense of *scarcely* or *with difficulty*, as in Amos iv. 11, *I have plucked thee as a fire-brand out of the fire*; or Zech. iii. 2, *Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?* or Jude 23, *Others save with fear, plucking them out of the fire*. So Livy (xx. 35), "In Æmilium Paulum, qui ex damnatione collegæ et sua prope ambustus evaserat."

"If," says Howe, "there be a day whereon the jealous God shall plead against the Christian church for its coldness in serious religion, and scandalous fervour about trivial formalities, then will the straw and stubble be burnt up, and such as were sincere, though too intent upon trifles, be saved, yet so as through fire." *Living Temple*, p. 319.

267. *Shew the necessity for an implicit belief in the authoritative power and absolute dominion of God.*

Creation is the production of the universe out of nothing. Now, the universe is composed of matter and spirit, either separately or in combination; and the creator is God. He who produced the effect must possess authoritative power and absolute dominion over his own creation. Any power that seems adverse to him exists by his permission, doubtless for wise purposes, and must be subject to his control. He creates darkness as well as light, and creates evil as well as makes peace. He sways all evil and rebellious agencies; commands them where to stop; makes the wrath of man subservient to his wise designs, and the remainder of wrath, when these designs are accomplished,

he restrains. God would not be God, if there were any other independent power. He alone is independent; for to call all things into existence, he must have existed before them, and must have created them by an act of his undisputed and indisputable will. He who created, preserves, and can destroy, whether a system or a sparrow. In prayer, we call him Almighty, and prayer implies his omnipotence; for if any thing (except what implies a contradiction) were too hard for him, there must be some paramount power to hinder his performance, and (like some of the lowest savages) we should pray to propitiate that power: God, then, could not be the sole object of prayer, that is, could not be almighty. God has established laws, by which the affairs of the universe are carried on, but these his power can set aside: in other words, he can work miracles. One of these laws is, that all men must die; but God has power to make any exceptions now, or to call any back to life. He did the former in the cases of Enoch and Elijah, the latter in raising Jesus; and he who hath raised up Christ, shall raise us up also by the word of his *power*. Indeed, as Christ is God with us, this power is said to belong to him: *I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it up again*. How necessary to belief in religion of any kind must be implicit belief in this omnipotent Being! How does it fill the devout with awe, that they approach the Lord of all power and might; the sorrowful with consolation, that their Friend has all its treasures; the righteous with trust, that all things will be made to work for their good; and the wicked with salutary terror, in knowing that Omnipotence is against them! How foolish, how impious, how daring to offend such a Being, in whose hand are the issues of life and death, and who can, with one word and in one moment, strike the sinner into nothing, or hurl him into the fathomless abyss!

268. Στύλος καὶ ἐδρίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, 1 Tim. iii. 15.
What do you suppose to be the precise meaning of these words?

“The pillar and *stay* of the truth,” ἐδραῖος, *stedfast*. The apostle alludes to the universal church, under its visible form of

government. The church, in St. Paul's time, was built on the apostles, who were the pillars of the Christian faith; and the catholic church now combines all churches holding the essential doctrines of the Gospel. Some commentators think there is a reference to the mode in which the large temples of antiquity and some cathedrals were erected, having a crypt underground, supporting the base, and the visible pillars propping the different parts of the building; as the church universal is the *ἰδραίωμα*, and the pillars support particular churches. The Roman Catholics say, that the pillars are the teachers of the church, that is, of *their* church; saying they are called *pillars*, *στυλοί*, in Gal. ii. 9, and a *foundation*, *θεμέλιον*, Ephes. ii. 20; adding, that all may securely rely on their faith. But St. Paul is here admonishing a bishop how he shall behave himself in the church—not how he shall *dictate* to the church, or collection of believers; and it is this collection of believers that are the pillars and ground of the truth, here mentioned in contradistinction to their bishop. Again, the church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, is *built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone*, Ephes. ii. 19, 20. That is the true church, then, whose doctrines can be traced to these sources; whose principles are according to the prophets and apostles, and the fundamental truths of Christianity; and wherein disciples are baptised agreeably to the *symbolum apostolicum*, which is a perfect summary of the Christian faith. Once more, the church is the pillar and ground of the truth because the apostles first presided in it, who were the pillars of the Christian faith; but being deteriorated, it was reformed according to the apostolic doctrine and discipline.

269. And the angel answering said unto him, I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God, and am sent to speak unto thee, Luke i. 19. *What is remarkable in the account here given?*

Although angels often appeared to the patriarchs, and are mentioned in every part of Scripture, it is thought that the names *Gabriel*, *Raphael*, *Michael*, &c., with the figurative description of their habits, characters, or employments, were bor-

rowed by the Jews, during the captivity, from the Chaldeans. Gabriel is *the strength of God*; Michael the archangel, *the holiness of God*; and Raphael, *the physic of God*. Gabriel was sent to Daniel (Dan. viii. 16), and to Zacharias, Luke i. 19; Michael fought with the evil spirit for the body of Moses (Jude 9, Zech. iii. 2), and with his angels against the dragon, Rev. xii. 7: Raphael is mentioned only in Tobit xii. 15. Horsley, referring to Daniel and the Apocalypse, thinks Michael to be our blessed Lord himself; *Sermon xxix.*

To *stand in the presence of God*, is a phrase taken from Oriental courts, where the favourite minister is alone admitted into the royal presence; and to *stand* in that presence is likewise an Oriental custom. This passage suggests the interesting subject of guardian spirits over communities and over individuals, for which last two texts, viz. Matt. xviii. 10 and Acts xii. 15, are referred to.

270. *Why might the opposition of the heathen world to the early propagation of Christianity have been reasonably expected?*

I. It was an uncompromising religion. The heathen sometimes admitted new religions into toleration, to be held along with their own idolatries; the magistrates, according to Gibbon, thinking them all equally useful. But Christ scorned to be admitted into the Pantheon on any other terms than the removal of all other divinities; and the apostles waged war against the superstitions of heathenism, while they rejected the flatteries of idolators, by calling on them to turn from these vanities unto the living God.

II. It was a pure and spiritual religion. It disallowed all rites which sought to compensate for want of inward piety—all ceremonies which seemed to compound with sensualities; and realising the maxim of the augurs, who dreaded a sacrifice without a heart, it preached faith—not an inert assent, but a principle producing a change of heart and life.

III. It boasted of no pomp or gratification of taste, having neither statue, picture, architecture, music (save a simple hymn), incense, splendid adornment, or imposing solemnity;

and must have been obviously obnoxious to all the trainers of victims, the makers of shrines for Diana, and the whole tribe of artists and operatives who lived by the gorgeousness and costliness of the heathen worship.

IV. It was mocked at by philosophers, and reviled on account of its partaking of the narrow-mindedness and exclusiveness of Judaism, which was hated and despised by the Gentiles. As a variety of Judaism, it was called the new superstition. It tended to cut short all the subtleties and disputations of the Academy and Lyceum respecting the supreme good, which it summed up in love to God and man.

V. It had to encounter the virulent opposition of a whole army of the pagan priesthood, whose occupation it proposed to extirpate.

VI. It rooted out all the fascinating dreams of mythology and charms of divination, which were so intimately connected with the popular poetry and faith; and the games of wild beasts, the gladiatorial contests, the glory of war, the pride of enlarged territory, and love of the world in any of its forms, all fell under its denunciations.

VII. It was subversive indirectly of many civil institutions, so far as they were connected with the popular superstitions. It bore an aspect of turbulence and revolution to those who knew it slightly; and its apostles were called, *they that had turned the world upside down*; as it had been said of their Master, *he stirreth up the people*.

VIII. Its doctrines misunderstood — especially that of decomposed, drowned, wasted, burnt, or dispersed bodies, restored to life, which seemed absurd, and that of a crucified God to be adored, which seemed not only absurd but impious. To believe in a God without a sensible image or representation, was deemed akin to atheism. It was styled new, and offended those who entertained a reverence for antiquity: it presented to the world a mean mechanic, in place of that mighty conqueror of whom oracles and tradition had spoken.

IX. Instead of according with preconceived opinions, it had every prejudice to encounter; instead of a favourable world, contempt, scorn, pride, incredulity.

271. Καὶ ἐκέλευσε τοῖς ὄχλοις ἀναπνεεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, Matt. xv. 35. *Does any classical author sanction the common translation of ἀναπνεεῖν?*

The proper word would be ἀνάκειμαι or ἀνακλίνω: but both Xenophon and Lucian use ἀναπίπτω. Xenoph. in *Œcon.* οἱ ἐμπλέοντες ἐν τάξει μὲν κάθονται, ἐν τάξει δ' ἀναπίπτουσιν. Lucian *de Asino*, xxiii. αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀναπνεόντες ἐδείπνουν. Cited by Wetstein.

272. And they covenanted with Judas for thirty pieces of silver, Matt. xxvi. 15: *what was the coin here designated as a piece of silver—the sum paid to the traitor Judas? and how does it prove that our Lord did indeed take on him the form of a servant?*

The piece of silver was the shekel, in value a little less than 2s. 6d.; so that, taking it at that amount, the sum paid to Judas was 3*l.* 15s. of English money; and this sum (or thirty shekels), as appears from Exod. xxi. 32, was the price given by the Mosaic law for a servant gores by an ox. As the ox was also to be stoned to death, this circumstance probably suggested to Judas the subsequent act of suicide. The fact throws light on Phil. ii. 7, *Christ took upon him the form of a servant.*

273. *Had the Jews at their feasts any custom resembling the celebration of the Lord's supper?*

They dipped their hands in a common dish, and had a cup of blessing. The later Jews had a wedding-garment, not their own, but *given* them by the master of the feast, which, being spiritualised, signifies being clothed with the righteousness of Christ. The most honoured or favourite guest sat nearest to the master of the feast. The three great festivals were religious commemorations—the passover, of the exodus; the pentecost, of the giving of the law; and the feast of tabernacles, of the dwelling in tabernacles in the wilderness. The Lord's supper was instituted for a perpetual remembrance of the Lord's death. The three great festivals were types, severally, of the true paschal Lamb—of the descent of grace on Whitsunday—and of Christ's tabernacling in the flesh: for that the birth of Christ happened during that feast is rendered probable by the fact, that shepherds do not

watch their flocks by night in Judea after the "former rains," in Marchesvan, or October. The Lord's supper is itself a type of the great marriage-supper of the Lamb in the kingdom of heaven.

274. Prove that the baptism of young children is most agreeable to the institution of Christ.

Circumcision, the corresponding rite by which persons entered the Jewish church, was performed on the eighth day after the birth of the infant; and both circumcision and baptism were symbols of deliverance from the guilt of original sin, the one by abscision, the other by ablution. The Jews added baptism to circumcision in the case of proselytes. When some brought young children to be touched and blessed by our Lord, and the apostles would have repulsed them, Jesus was much displeased, and said unto them, *Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven: and he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.* If, then, they are fit to be brought to him for a blessing, they are fit to enter, by covenant, into his church. If he had intended baptism to be confined to adults, no doubt he would have somewhere mentioned it; but there is no manifest intimation of such a prohibition of infants in his words, or in the apostolic writings. The jailor of Philippi was baptised in the middle of the night, with his whole house; and so was Cornelius, with his family,—both probably including young children. The apostle tells the Jewish converts, that *all their fathers were baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea*; and the *children* of their forefathers passed through the Red Sea, and partook of that baptism. *The promise*, said Peter on the day and after the miracle of pentecost, when he exhorted the Jews to be baptised for the remission of sins,—*the promise* (that is, the promise of the covenant) *is to you and to your children*, Acts ii. 39. If this rite be omitted in regard to children dying in infancy, the only authorised gate of salvation, through the name by which alone salvation comes, is shut. *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*, 1 Cor. vii. 14.

As circumcision had been the federal act of admission into

the Mosaic covenant, so was baptism into the Christian covenant — being only the change of the symbol. *In whom (Christ) we are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism.* Without an express prohibition, therefore, every thing respecting the age of the parties admitted into covenant continues the same.

All the early Fathers mention, and the primitive Christians used, infant baptism. "Christ came," says Irenæus, "to save us all by himself—all, I say, who are born again to God through him; infants and young children, and boys and young men, and old men." *Adv. Hær.* l. ii. c. 39. And Cyprian, in his sixty-fourth epistle, "If no one is debarred from receiving baptism and grace, however sinful, how much more ought not these benefits to be denied to an infant, who has as yet no way sinned, except according to the sin of Adam," &c.

275. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Lord's supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.

This question is directed against the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, on the one hand, and the Socinian notion of a mere act of commemoration, on the other. If we admit the latter, all men, good and wicked, might partake of a mere commemorative rite, nor would there be any necessity for self-examination before eating of that bread, or, indeed, any eating unworthily; and, consequently, there could not be such an offence as being guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, 1 Cor. xi. 27, 28; there would be no discerning of the Lord's body, and no man's eating and drinking damnation to himself, 1 Cor. xi. 29. The holy communion would be little else than an anniversary dinner at Freemasons' Hall; and the most joyous companion would be the worthiest communicant. But how will this tally with John vi. 51-55? *I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give him is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his*

flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, &c. There is, therefore, a *real presence*; and these words are so strong as to have led to Luther's doctrine of consubstantiation, *verus panis et verum corpus Christi*. Thus he reconciled the unchanged substance with a communion, in which believers might be "one in the Father and the Son, as the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father." But here he did not sufficiently discern, that that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit—that *faith* is required to detect, in the element of water, received grace, which constitutes the one sacrament, and in bread, the received body of Christ, which makes the other, John iii. 6; for the things of the Spirit of God are spiritually discerned, and without faith in the recipient the body of Christ is not spiritually present in the eucharist.

As to the real *corporeal* presence, by transubstantiation, in the eucharist, it contradicts the evidence of sight, touching, and tasting—which no miracle ever did. It makes a thing the symbol of itself, which overthroweth the nature of a sacrament. When Christ said, *This is my body*, he could not speak literally, for his body was before his disciples: neither could he say, *which is broken for you*, for he was not yet crucified, and his words could only mean, "which is *to be* broken;" just as his blood was then actually in his veins, and could not literally be said to have been shed. The Jews had a horror at drinking blood, as they would feel repugnance to the cannibalism of eating flesh; and as the apostles were inquisitive on other occasions, their taking the bread from their Master's hand, without surprise or question, shews that they were satisfied that they only received a symbol.

This is, is a frequent idiom of Scripture, signifying, "this signifies," or, "is equivalent to." *This is the law and the prophets; this is eternal life to know thee, &c.; this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.* Christ says of the cup, *This is the new testament in my blood*; not, "this is my blood in the new testament." *Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my*

blood, said our Lord, *hath eternal life*, John vi. 54; and in a few verses he explains, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life*, ver. 63.

Transubstantiation represents as many times offered him who, by one oblation of himself once offered, put away sin; *who needed not daily, as the high-priests under the law, to offer sacrifices for sins, for this he did once, when he sacrificed himself*, Heb. vii. 27; *who died unto sin once*, Rom. vi. 10; *who entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us*, Heb. ix. 12. *Nor yet that he should offer himself often, for then would he often have suffered; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*, Heb. ix. 26. *But this* [man] *person, αὐτός, after he had offered one sacrifice for sin, for ever sat down at the right hand of God*, Heb. x. 12.

That the believing in Christ was the eating of Christ, and led to eternal life, is plain from his dialogue with the Jews: *Give us this bread. I am the bread of life: he that cometh unto me shall never hunger; and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.* The bread and wine in the eucharist, after consecration, are repeatedly called "bread and wine," and not the body of Christ. *For as oft as ye eat of this BREAD, and drink of this CUP, ye do shew forth the Lord's death until he come. I will not drink of this fruit of the vine, until I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.*

276. *What is the meaning of regeneration and habitual grace?*

Regeneration is that first illapse of the Spirit of God which produces a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness. It takes place in baptism, whereby, being by *nature* the children of wrath, or exposed to wrath through our birth-sin and inborn corruption, we are made the children or recipients of grace: and *habitual grace*, or sanctification, is that constant and progressive supply of the Holy Spirit which God will not refuse to them that ask him, and by which we walk in newness of life, Rom. vi. 4, 2 Cor. v. 17. Regeneration takes

place but once; and in this the soul, except in the case of adults, is passive, and God works upon it alone. We may be daily renewed in the spirit of our minds, John iii. 3, 2 Cor. iv. 16, Eph. iv. 22, 23, 24; but in renewal, or under habitual grace, the soul is active. It may grieve the Spirit, resist it, quench it; and, on the other hand, it may seek the Spirit in prayer, and be a worker together with it, our spirits bearing witness *with* his Spirit that we are the children of God, Rom. viii. 16, 2 Cor. vi. 1; and this is the duty of a probationary being. It is likewise the means of obtaining fresh and increased supplies of spiritual aid, not by *deserving* a grace of congruity, but by manifesting to God an *aptitude* for the accumulated reception, on the principle that unto him who hath shall be given. Accordingly, persons are spoken of as already regenerated in baptism; but, as come to years of discretion, they are *invited* to renewal, Eph. iv. 23, Col. iii. 10. Grant's *Religious Exercises*, p. 26.

277. *How do you explain the latter part of Matthew xxvi. 64, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man, &c.? Give the exact meaning of ἀπ' ἄρτι.*

Caiaphas, at the trial of our Lord, had adjured him solemnly to declare whether he were indeed the Christ, the Son of God. Our Saviour replied, *Thou hast said*, the Jewish method of assent; and added, as a proof of his assertion, *Hereafter* (ἀπ' ἄρτι, in a little while from this time; ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, Luke xxii. 69) *shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of power, and come in the clouds of heaven.* "Hand," says Daubuz, "is the symbol of power and strength, and the right hand, of the chiefest power and strength," p. 58. He adds, that the expression, Mark xvi. 19, *Christ sat at the right hand of God*, is equivalent to Mark xiv. 62, *Sitting on the right hand of power*; and signifies, that divine power and authority is communicated to Christ. Now, all these three evangelists refer the reply of our Lord to the time of his trial; and the words are to be explained by the parallel passage of Matt. xxiv. 30, wherein our Lord is speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem,—an event which should take place before the end of the then ex-

isting generation. To come in the clouds of heaven, or, to come with a multitude of hosts, as the instruments of power, is represented as God's coming to execute vengeance on a guilty nation; 2 Sam. xxii. 8, the earth trembled, and the heavens shook; and Psalm xcvi. 23, Nahum i. 45, Joel, ch. ii. The words, then, in Matt. xxvi. 64, refer, in a highly figurative style, to the destruction of Jerusalem; and this is rendered more certain by the phrase ἀπ' ἀπρὶ, *henceforward*. The figurative expression was probably employed by our Lord, in order to set forth the typical character of that event, as—itself a faint image—foreshewing the more terrible but analogous event, the end of the world. The Jews had asked our Lord two questions; 1st, When shall the destruction of the temple be? and, 2dly, When shall the end of the world be? They conceived that these events would happen simultaneously. Our Lord disabuses them of that mistaken notion, by telling them, that the period of the former event was fixed as to come within that generation; but at the 36th verse to the end, he refers to the destruction of the world—the day of judgment—*THAT* day; that day of which knoweth no man, nor the angels, but the Father only. Not to reveal when *that day* should arrive was an act of the same wisdom which hides from every man the day of his own dissolution; both enforcing the duties of continual watchfulness and self-preparation.

278. *In what does St. John's Gospel differ from those of the other evangelists, and at whose request was it written?*

The Gospel of St. John differs from the others in not being a professed history of our Lord, but a controversial work, directed against the heresies which sprung up in the early church, and chiefly against the various orders of Gnostics, by relating our Saviour's discourses. He omits many facts related by the other evangelists, as already well known, and as not suiting his particular purpose. As the Gnostic heresy, which was the early blossom of Arianism, principally infected the churches of Asia, John undertook his answer *at the request of the Asiatic bishops*; see Percy's *Key*. He begins by shewing,

against the Cerinthians, that the Word, $\delta \lambda \acute{o} \gamma \omicron \varsigma$, was not a created æon, the Demiurgus of the world, but *was in the beginning with God, and was God*, John i. 1. The other evangelists record events—John lays down principles; and what they mention incidentally, he brings forward systematically. He exalts the Saviour, and proves his divine character. Instead of relating his birth at Bethlehem, he begins by shewing the existence of his divine nature from eternity, and after this golden proëme, goes at once to his baptism and public ministry. He then sketches the most important miracles which evinced his divine power, coupled with his assertions and proofs of the divine character of the Son of God; and the latter half of his book is taken up with the transactions of one or two days immediately preceding the death of his Master. John omits the transfiguration, though honourable to himself as a witness; he likewise omits the ascension into heaven, although he distinctly implies it in the Apocalypse. In short, John was the declared antagonist of Cerinthians, Nicolaitans, and Ebionites. Although he relates some transactions not adverted to by the other writers,—for instance, the conversation with Nicodemus, and that with the woman of Samaria,—he did not write to supply the deficiencies of the others, but gleans some facts which it comported with his main object to make prominent,—the work of the Spirit, the personal Sonship of the Messiah, the spiritual nature of God, and the actual death and resurrection of Jesus. He shews our Lord to be the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world, even before his baptism, in opposition to those Gnostics who denied the miraculous conception, and conceived the $\lambda \acute{o} \gamma \omicron \varsigma$ to have descended upon the man at the moment of his entering the baptismal water.

279. *Give Burnet's explanation of regeneration and habitual grace.*

Burnet, referring to our Saviour's discourse with Nicodemus, says, that in the words, *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit*, he enjoined baptism as an ablution, which imported the outward profession of a change of doctrine and of heart, and likewise a real inward change, by a secret power called the

Spirit, which should transform a man's nature, without which he could not enter the kingdom of God, *or the dispensation of the Messiah*. Baptism, then, is a precept, to be obeyed because commanded; but is not the *opus operatum* of salvation, unless it be mixed with unswerving faith in the recipient, Heb. iv. 2. Thus he explains Mark xvi. 16, *He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; and he that believeth not* (though baptised) *shall be damned*.* But faith is receiving the whole Gospel as true, relying on its promises, and observing its laws; and this is the truth, which gives a title to the blessings of the new covenant. Burnet does not think we cannot be saved without baptism; for, as that rite is performed by another, it would be putting our salvation in the power of that other. He explains Titus iii. 5, *God hath saved us by the washing of regeneration* (i. e. baptism, the precept) *and the renewing of the Holy Ghost*, the inward thing signified.

Baptism is the sign of the entrance into the Christian church, as circumcision was that of entrance into the Jewish church; and as the Jews baptised proselytes by immersion, and changed their old and wet garments for others new and white on the return out of the water. This ceremony, with its meaning, was adopted into the Christian covenant: the persons (including their children) so baptised were said, by the washing of *regeneration*, to be dead to sin, buried with Christ, risen and quickened with him, and alive unto God, Rom. vi. *passim*, and Col. ii. 11-13. Baptism is a federal act, the sign of forgiveness and of adoption in Christ. God promises spiritual blessings on the one hand, and we pledge ourselves to obedience on the other; a failure in which obedience is to be remedied through Christ, by repentance and faith. Now God, in coming to this covenant, gives the earnest of the Spirit, 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5, Eph. i. 14; "a part of the price as a surety for the remainder," Parkhurst; or, as in Rom. viii. 23, a *first-fruits*, derived from the paschal sheaf of the first-fruits, which sanctified the whole

* To infants dying immediately after baptism, it is the *opus operatum* of salvation; but as grace is, in great measure, lost and frustrated in youth, the adults are called upon to give that personal and operative faith which was given for them by proxy in infancy.

harvest: as in 1 Cor. xv. 20, Christ is *the first-fruits of them that slept*—a *surety* for a general harvest of the resurrection. Now this first-fruits of the Spirit is the grace of regeneration in baptism, and is a pledge for that *habitual grace* which is necessary to sustain obedience, or to aid repentance. And because ye are sons (by adoption), God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, whereby ye can (habitually, unless by your own remissness) say, *Abba, Father.**

From mistaking the phrase, *the kingdom of God*, as if it signified eternal glory, and not entrance into the dispensation of the Messiah, arose the notion that the mere act of baptism, without the requisite sponson, insured eternal life; but St. Peter shews that the benefit consists not in the mere washing or putting away of the filth of the flesh, but in the answer of a good conscience towards God, 1 Pet. iii. 21. In short, baptism or regeneration is an outward act and an inward vow. The *outward act* entitles to the benefits of Christ's church—adoption, grace, and, in case of death, Christian burial. But if any be deficient in the inward act, they admit of renewal, by repentance through grace. In infant regeneration all is done that can be done to entitle the party baptised to the benefits of the church. The sponson is made, and the inward act presupposed, until the adult be able to answer for himself.

280. *Prove the Holy Ghost to be truly God, of the same substance with the Father and the Son.*

The Holy Ghost is truly God, because the attributes which belong to God are ascribed to him. Omnipresence; for, *Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?* Ps. cxxxix. 7. Omniscience, 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11; *for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.* Omnipotence, Job xxxiii. 4, *The Spirit of God hath made me.*

The Holy Ghost is not a mere influence or different aspect of God the Father, but a distinct person, as is proved by the

* Justification through faith is only retrospective, and is valid only so long as "faith" continues; but as that may be enfeebled, lost, and revived, there may be a first and final justification, ay, there may be *twenty* justifications in a man's life.

various passages of the New Testament, in which the masculine article refers to the neuter noun. He is also another Paraclete or Advocate sent by the Son from the Father, John xv. 26. The divinity of the Holy Ghost is again proved from Acts v. 3, 4, where Peter tells Ananias that he had lied to the Holy Ghost; and in the following verse (4), that he had lied unto God. And as (though a distinct person) he is of one substance with the Father, so is he also with the Son; for it is of the Holy Ghost that the Son speaks when he says, on leaving the world, *Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.* Compare this passage with what he had before told them, *Me ye have not always,* John xii. 8, Matt. xxvi. 11; or with John xvi. 28, *I leave the world, and go unto my Father;* and you will perceive at once the mystical unity of the second and third persons of the Trinity. But the distinctness of their personality is shewn in our Lord's promise, *I will pray unto the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth,* John xiv. 16; or, that the three persons in one Godhead may be manifested, *the Comforter, whom I will send unto you from the Father,* John xv. 26. Again, the Holy Ghost is sometimes called the *Spirit of the Father,* Luke xxiv. 49 (compare this with Acts xxiii. 38, John xiv. 16); or *the Spirit which proceedeth from the Father,* John xv. 26; and sometimes the Spirit of the Son, *God hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts,* Gal. iv. 6.

And yet this Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα, neut.) is called the Paraclete or Advocate, and he (ἐκεῖνος, masc.) guides into all truth, John xvi. 13, 14. He is *another* Paraclete, and sent *by the Son from the Father.* He cannot be the Father, for he receives from the Father, John xvi. 14; and the Father gives, but does not receive. He cannot be the Son, for he is sent from the Son; and yet he is of one substance with both, all three being divine, and severally possessing the attributes of divinity. Being three Persons, but one God, they must needs be of one substance; for *substance* means *essential quality*, and divinity is the essential quality of the three Persons; and if all be God, they must be of the same essential quality; if they were of dif-

ferent essential qualities, they could not all be God. As Macedonius objected at the Council of Nice (A.D. 325) to the clause, "being of one substance with the Father," and proposed *ὁμοούσιος* instead of *ὁμοούσιος*, the Athanasian creed, with a view to this and other errors, enjoined men to believe in the Trinity, "neither confounding the *persons* nor dividing the *substance*:" for the Sabellians *confounded the persons*, by calling the Word and Holy Ghost emanations from the Father, like radiance and heat from the sun, and allowing but one Person in the Godhead.

The Apollinarians thought Christ to be informed by the Godhead, instead of an intellectual soul; which introduced the words, "perfect God, and perfect man; of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting." On the other hand, the Macedonians and Arians *divided the substance*: the former, by making the Holy Spirit a *created* power, diffused over all creatures; the latter, by making the Son the first *created* Being, and Son only by *adoption*. The Sabellian heresy is adopted by the modern Swedenburgians. The modern Socinians have gone to the bathos of the Arian error. The Eutychians afterwards thought the human nature of Christ absorbed in the divinity, as a drop of vinegar is lost in the ocean—an approach to Sabellianism. The Nestorians denied the title of *θεότοκος* to belong to Christ, whom they called *Χριστότοκος*. This seems to have been a question about words, and in Nestorius shewed an inclination to Arianism; while Eutychus, who took a contrary view of the incarnation, betrayed a Gnostic opinion of the *apparent* sufferings of Christ, which denied the atonement. See Script. Proofs of the Creed; Society's Tracts, 448; Horne's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity; Jones's do.; Waterland on the Athan. Creed; Nares on the Three Creeds; Grant's Sermon on the Trinity, vol. ii. p. 27. Texts shewing the Holy Ghost to proceed from the Father and the Son, Matt. x. 20, John xv. 26, Acts ii. 23, Rom. viii. 9, Gal. iv. 6. That he is the same both in majesty and essence, Exod. xxv. 1, 8, 9; compare Heb. viii. 5, ix. 8. Acts xxviii. 25. That he is true and very God, Ps. cxxxix. 7, Is. xi. 2, Acts v. 3, 4, 1 Cor. iii. 16, Philip. i. 19.

281. *Who were the γραμματεῖς, νομικοί, νομοδιδάσκαλοι, and στρατηγοὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ?*

The γραμματεῖς, or scribes, were learned persons, employed either in transcribing or explaining the sacred books, and were distributed into two orders, civil and ecclesiastical. The latter were the νομικοί, or public instructors of the people, who sat in Moses' seat, and were, consequently, sometimes called scribes, and sometimes lawyers. The question, Which is the great commandment? was proposed by a νομικός, *lawyer*, in Matt. xxii. 25, and by εἰς τῶν γραμματῶν in Mark xii. 28. As the scribes are often coupled with the Pharisees, it is presumed they were generally of that sect.

The γραμματεῖς in Acts xix. 35, translated the *town-clerk*, was the keeper of records, treaties, decrees, &c., called γράμματα, and appears to have been president of the council. The difference between scribes and lawyers is thought to be this, that the one taught in the schools, and the other in the synagogues.

The νομικοί were superior to the γραμματεῖς, and indeed their teachers, as appears by the climax in Luke xi. 44-46. The νομοδιδάσκαλοι, doctors or teachers of the law of Moses, occur three times in the New Testament, viz. in Luke v. 17, Acts v. 34, and 1 Tim. i. 7. These were the rabbins, the masters, or excellents, who sat teaching on elevated seats, having their disciples on the ground below them, and were in high reputation among the people. They were versed both in the written and oral law, as distinguished from the Caraites, who confined themselves to the letter of the *lex scripta*, and the cabbalists, who studied only the mystical interpretation of it. Gamaliel was a νομοδιδάσκαλος; and as St. Paul was educated at his feet, Acts xxii. 3, he was exceedingly zealous of the traditions of the elders, Gal. i. 14. But the νομοδιδάσκαλοι censured in 1 Tim. i. 7, appear to have been Judaizing Christians, who taught a mixture of the *law* and the Gospel, without due discernment as to what parts of the law *were abolished*, and what were of perpetual obligation. "Desiring," says Whitby, "to be teachers of the law, and yet understanding not what they say of it; neither the sense, scope, nor true meaning of the law,

nor any certainty of the traditions of which they speak so confidently." Burton thinks these were the Gnostics; but Whitby and Bloomfield, by comparing the passage with the *Ἰουδαίους μύθοις* of Titus i. 14, pronounce that they were converted Jews, in a yet imperfect state of instruction.

The *στρατηγοὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ* were not Roman but Jewish officers: the term being military, as derived from *מִצָּדָה*, Numb. viii. 24, 25, where, in the margin, the service of the tabernacle is twice called a warfare. The captain of the temple, mentioned Acts iv. 1, v. 24, was the officer who presided over the officiatory priests and Levites in the order of their course, and appointed to them their several offices. He was of equal rank and authority with the high priest and chief priests, or heads of the twenty-four courses, Acts v. 24; Eleazer, the son of Aaron, was the chief of the Levites, Numb. iii. 32; and Azariah was ruler of the house of God; Josephus mentions such an officer by the name of *στρατηγός*, who was a Jew, the high-priest's son, *Antiq.* lib. xx. cap. 5, § 28; and says (*De Bello*, lib. vi. cap. 5, § 3) that the watchers in the Temple told the *captain*, when the Beautiful gate opened at midnight of its own accord. The *στρατηγοί* mentioned in Luke xxii. 52 were subalterns, commanding the separate parties of priests and Levites, the principal *στρατηγός* being their head. The priests kept watch in three places of the Temple, and the Levites in twenty-one; and each watch had a superintendent—all of whom were under the *ἀρχηγός*.

282. *What places of religious worship were used by the Jews, from their first coming out of Egypt to their final destruction as a nation?*

Agreeably to a plan or pattern imparted by God to Moses on Mount Sinai, the tabernacle, or movable tent, was set up in the wilderness, and, on the entrance into Canaan, was fixed in Shiloh, a city of Ephraim, where it remained until the time of Eli, when it was taken by the Philistines, above 300 years. The ark of the covenant was then taken in battle by the Philistines, who soon sent it back to Bethshemesh, and thence to Kirjath-jearim, 1 Sam. vi. 19, 21, where it remained until the reign

of David, who brought it to Mount Zion, where it was placed in a tent within curtains. The zeal of David induced him to prepare the materials for a house having foundations worthy of the living God; but God would not suffer him, as a man of war, to execute such a work; and accordingly the Temple was erected by Solomon, the Peaceful (B.C. 1004), on Mount Moriah, where it stood till its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, B.C. 606. The Jews in their captivity observed the laws of Moses, worshipped their own God; and had places of prayer allowed them, Esther iv. 14. Soon after their return, Zerubbabel set up an altar, on which the burnt-offerings were consumed, and in the second year began to build a second temple, which, after some interruptions, was completed, B.C. 518; and this, repaired and beautified by Herod nearly 500 years afterwards, B.C. 17, continued until it was utterly consumed by Titus, A.C. 70.

In the mean time, the Israelites, who had rebelled under Jeroboam, worshipped God during 254 years under the symbol of two golden images, called calves, set up at Dan and Bethel, until the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by Salmaneser, B.C. 721. The Assyrian monarch having carried the ten tribes captive, planted colonies of idolaters in their room, mixed with some of the lower Israelites; and a priest being sent among them to instruct them in the religion of the former occupants, they established a mixed religion. Repulsed in their attempts to join the Jews in rebuilding the Temple at Jerusalem, they erected a temple for themselves in Mount Gerizim, where they observed the laws of Moses till the coming and death of Christ. But in rebuilding the Temple of Jerusalem, Ezra began to *multiply* synagogues, or houses of worship, throughout all cities, though there are some traces of them before the captivity, Ps. lxxiv. 3, which deprives him of the honour of their first introduction; and this reformation proceeded till it was completed, in the time of Simon the Just, B.C. 300. Wherever there was a synagogue, Ezra placed a copy of the Jewish Scriptures, and thus provided for the instruction of the people; insomuch that the Jews, who had been so prone to idolatry before the captivity, never relapsed into it afterwards. In Jerusalem there are said to have been 500 syna-

gogues: and wherever there were Jews or Israelites throughout the earth, there were there synagogues and Scriptures. Trading companies had their own; and wherever there were ten free Jews to assist at the service, a synagogue was built. In the time of the apostles, Moses was read in the synagogues in every city, every Sabbath-day, Acts xv. 21; and the prophets were likewise read in Jerusalem, Acts xiii. 27.

In every synagogue was a desk or pulpit, where the law was read from a roll, which was kept in an ark or chest covered with embroidered cloth. Prayers and chants formed part of the service of the synagogue. The women, separated from the men, were seated in a gallery enclosed with lattices, that they might hear without being seen.

The *προσευχαί*, or oratories, differed from the synagogues in that the latter were covered, while the oratories were open to the heaven. They are translated in Luke xvi. 12, and Acts xvi. 13, 16, as either signifying the act of prayer, or a place where prayer was wont to be made. They were open courts, planted with trees, and situated by the side of a river or brook, where devotees were accustomed to spend the night in prayer, *διανυκτερεύειν*, Luke vi. 12. "By prayer," say the best commentators, "we are to understand not prayer alone, but holy meditation and devout thankfulness, which ought to precede and follow prayer." Even a heathen (Artemidorus, *Oneir.* 3. 53) testifies of heathens *οὐδεὶς ἄπεισιν εἰς προσευχήν, μὴ οὐχὶ φροντίζειν σφόδρα, to think intensely.* The darkness of the night, the starry canopy of the heavens, and the denseness of the grove, contributed to shut out the world, and to infuse solemnity into the thoughts; while the soft passing stream was not only adapted for purification, but calculated to lull the mind into peace, and to exclude other impressions. *Προσευχή* is sometimes used even with the article for prayer simply, as Matt. xxi. 22.

A decree of the Halicarnassians, cited by Josephus, *Antiq.* lib. iv. cap. 10, sect. 23, gives the Jews liberty *τὰς προσευχὰς ποιῆσθαι πρὸς τῇ θαλάσῃ, κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος.* See Wetstein, Parkhurst, Whitby, Doddridge, Lardner's *Credibility*.

283. *The story for which the early propagators of Christianity suffered must have been miraculous.*

An obscure peasant, and a few companions as obscure as himself, in a remote and mountainous region of a country then held in proverbial contempt, and springing from a religion derided and hated, are supposed to have laid a plan for effecting a complete moral revolution in the world; and they are known to have succeeded.

They gave out that this carpenter's son was miraculously born of a virgin; then distinguished in humble life, through the overshadowing power of the Holy Ghost; and that, after going about doing good, and working miracles, during a public ministry of three years, he was crucified as a slave, and rose again on the third day after his death; in forty days after which he ascended into heaven. They affirmed that this same Jesus was the Son of God, the Fulfiller of all the prophecies, the Bruiser of the serpent's head, the Star out of Israel, the Branch from the stem of Jesse, the Shiloh, the Messiah, cut off for the sins of men; and that there is salvation in no other name than his.

On these truths they grounded a self-denying religion, which admitted of no pompous rites, no exciting ceremonies, that might stand in the place of their demand of *a change in the whole disposition*, and draw off attention from the one thing needful, the purification of the heart: a religion which, in that its first age, demanded a renunciation of this world, and of all its captivating allurements of pleasure, ambition, and aggrandisement; which separated its professors from their domestic affections, and exposed them to reproach, derision, persecution, loss of all things, and loss of life.

The religion they preached admitted of no compromise—it would not be satisfied with being one of many. It condemned, and sought to absorb or extinguish all others. It destroyed the boasted privileges of the Jew, and admitted the Gentiles to an equality of divine favour with him, although it forfeited favour with them by denouncing their idolatries. It anathematised the various systems of philosophy, as guides that misled the inquirer, and as babblings incompatible with the pure simplicity of truth

as it is in Jesus. Its Author, in sending forth his first missionaries, gave them this charge: "Go, and make the Osiris of the Egyptians, the Baal of the Canaanites, the Moloch of the Midianites, the Dagon of the Philistines (should the root of such idolatries remain), the Diana of the Ephesians, the Oromasdes of the Persians, the Brama of the Hindoos, the Odin of the Scandinavians, the Jupiter of the Greeks and Romans, and all the idols which the ignorance and superstition of mortals hath set up, whose images are the pride of art, whose priests are a countless host, whose altars smoke with hecatombs, whose temples are the glory of architecture, and whose EXTERNAL rites flatter mankind with a vain notion of religion, as atoning for the absence of the worship in spirit and in truth which you are charged with recommending,—make all these fall down before the invisible God; and, above all, destroy the more obstinate idols of the heart, attachment to which sets up the gods of wood and stone; and see that my name *alone* (for I am a jealous God) may be glorified from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same. Do all this without money, without power, without patronage, without protection; carry neither scrip nor purse, carry no arms but your patience, no treasures but your innocence, no talents but simplicity and candour, no eloquence but the force of truth; set at nought all the pretended theories of philosophy, plant the cross upon the Areopagus, and make the stone which was rejected by the builders the head-stone of the corner." Such was the commission, and such were the instruments; now see the opposition these propagators had to encounter.

It is true that the Jews, relying on their ancient prophecies, expected a Messiah about the time of our Lord's appearance; but not having learned to spiritualise his magnificent titles, and to understand his promised conquests to be those over the rebellious hearts of men, their prejudices forbade them to admit the lowly Jesus to be the individual pointed out. They despised him as a ridiculous impostor; but not being able to reconcile the predictions of his lowliness and sufferings with those of his grandeur and victories (in the only true way, that of spiritualising the latter), they afterwards conjured up the idea of a

Messiah Ben Joseph, who should die, and a Messiah Ben David, who was to conquer and to live for ever. Their worldly pride and love of conquest revolted at the humility, poverty, and peacefulness of Jesus. They would further be likely to hate and obstruct a religion, the success of which would bring on them the shame of crucifying an innocent person. Their boast of being, alone of all nations, God's chosen people, entitled to exclusive privileges, could not brook a doctrine which threw down the middle wall of partition, and admitted the Gentiles (whom they expected to subjugate) to equal favour with themselves. Imperfectly instructed in the mystery of a triune God, they received the pretensions of the Saviour to divinity as blasphemies; and the announced absorption of all their rites and ceremonies, which were taught them by God himself, in one low and human *propitiation*, could not fail to be obnoxious. It would have been madness to preach such doctrines, with the slightest hope or prospect of success, to men fraught with such prejudices, without an argument drawn from miracles, which could bear the closest investigation among professed witnesses, who surrendered their lives sooner than forego their testimony. But even the miracles were discredited by many, as the prophecies, in their application, were denied. The early propagators of the Gospel had to prosecute their undertaking among the *Gentiles*, amidst the opposition of a whole world lying in wickedness; a *common people*, sensual and debased, who loved a religion of show, and hated one of self-denial, and pleaded the example of their own impure gods as an apology for their own impurities; a *priesthood*, who lived by the costly rites of superstition, with the whole retinue of inferior officers and tradesmen, who depended for support on the temples, altars, and victims; *magistrates*, who, thinking all religions equally useful, sought to preserve things as they were,—Gallios, who cared nothing about religion, and who deemed the preachers of a new form (a new superstition, as they termed it), which sought to abolish all but itself, to be seditious persons, who turned the world upside down; *philosophers*, who, thinking all religions equally false, would number Christianity with the others, who derided the notion of a resurrection, or the idea of a crucified God, and who extended

their abhorrence from the religion of the Jews, as uncompromising, and as rejecting the admixture of any other, to the religion of Jesus, which sprang from it. Such were the obstructions to the vast design, and such the seeming impotence and inadequacy of the instruments; and yet that vast design was accomplished, and those weak instruments triumphed, and those obstructions gave way. To what can we attribute this but to the convincing force of the miracles, and principally of that grand miracle, the resurrection of Christ? submitting to be sifted, and perseveringly promulgated in the face of crosses, and fires, and wild beasts, and all the appalling array of martyrdom.

The prophecies were misunderstood; the internal excellence of the Gospel could have made by itself but few triumphs; but in fact we find, that in thirty years after the mission of the apostles, Christians had multiplied in all the known world, and being in Rome an immense multitude, provoked a grievous persecution from Nero. From Judea, as a centre, the apostles diverged in all directions, and swiftly made many converts by their preaching among men of different languages—to be intelligible to whom required *one miracle* at least, the gift of tongues, which modern missionaries acquire after years of application, and which is the first grand difficulty in the way of converting the heathen, to be overcome. Pliny the younger, at the end of the first century, represents to Trajan the difficulty of keeping under the Christians by tortures, which only proved, by the constancy with which they were endured, the means of increasing the number of confessors. He complains of deserted temples, and altars without victims: “Visa est enim mihi res digna consultatione, maxime propter periclitantium numerum: multi enim omnis ætatis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur. Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam, et agros *superstitionis* istius contagio pervagata est.” He seems touched with a gleam of compassion and horror at his own injustice, which he dreads to communicate to his master. Thus the blood of the martyrs became the seed of the church. Towards the end of the second century, Tertullian writes in his Apology: “Though but of yesterday, yet have

we filled your cities, islands, castles, corporations, councils, your armies themselves, and the courts of justice." Arnobius, a converted philosopher of the third century, asks, "Who would not believe the Gospel, when he sees in how short a time it has converted so great a part of the world; when men of great knowledge, orators, grammarians, rhetoricians, lawyers, physicians, and philosophers, have thrown up their former opinions, and embraced its doctrines?"

All these numerous conversions were not the mere assent to a historical fact—a speculative opinion, to be enjoyed in peace; but, in the first place, they were a renunciation of the world—an abandonment of rooted prejudices of sentiment and of education—an entire change of heart, and mind, and life; and, in the second, a sacrifice of friends and fortune—a self-exposure to imminent danger—an almost certain encountering of reproach, and torment, and fiery trials. How soon these persecutions began, and how severe they were, St. Paul tells us, 1 Cor. iv. 9, by speaking of the apostles set forth last, as appointed unto death—a *spectacle* (θεάτρον) to men and angels; and we have the subsequent testimony of many heathen writers to the dreadful persecutions, the tortures by fire, the cross, wild beasts, swords and axes, and sheathings in lighted pitch, as torches to illuminate the night, to which the profession of Christianity exposed its disciples.

Now, to what are we to attribute this astonishing change in the world, in men's minds and dispositions, all in so sudden a manner, particularly when it is compared with the slow and almost imperceptible conquest of modern missionaries over the idolatries of heathenism? No doubt, as Christianity made progress, to witness the invincible constancy of martyrs under unheard-of torments, enkindled a desire to make witness of a like confession; but the constancy was in maintaining the truth of the miracles: and if we trace this imitative constancy back through three generations, we come to the original witnesses, and can only account by the reality of the miracles for their invincible constancy unto death. There is no other solution of the fact; there is no other argument that could have gained the first converts. Unless by the argument of the miracles, and

their reality, would the Jews have been persuaded to give up their hopes of dominion, and boast of being the peculiarly chosen people, to see the swallowing up of their own rites and sacrifices by the harmless life and obnoxious doctrine of a wandering peasant; while the Gentiles suspected the assumed title of a king, and neither understood nor relished the spiritual nature of his kingdom? "In all controversies," says Paley, "miraculous evidence was either mentioned or presupposed as the primary ground of argument; in the absence of which, no discussion could for a moment have been entertained."

The miracles were wrought at public feasts, in Jerusalem, before multitudes of hostile and suspicious Jews, or by the wayside, or in open day, preached to the generation who witnessed them, and maintained while 500 who witnessed the chief miracle, the resurrection, were yet alive to be questioned. They were not done in a corner. If they could have been disproved, the religion would have been strangled in its cradle. They were the kind of miracles which prophecy had foretold; for Isaiah had said of the Messiah, that he should open the blind eyes, and unstop the ears of the deaf, and make the tongue of the dumb to sing, and make the lame to leap as a hart, Isaiah xxxv. 5, 6. The bitterest enemies of Christ acknowledged, *This man doth many miraeles*; and they were attributed to Beelzebub,—but never denied. They were the more probable, from their being wrought to attest a pure doctrine, confirmed by a holy pattern; to set forth and support the intelligence of atonement for sin, and that of a resurrection; and not from any motive of personal aggrandisement, or worldly policy, or minor, or partial, or common-place advantage. In short, if the world, without the miracles, embraced Christianity, as urged by poor peasants, with all its inward purity, and with all its dangers from without, and that too with a rapidity to which modern zeal can produce nothing like a parallel, this very fact would be a greater miracle than all the others.

"Se 'l mondo si rivolse al Christianesimo,
Diss' io senza miracoli, quest' uno
E tal' che gli altri non sono 'l centesimo."

Dante, *Paradiso*, canto xx. 14.

284. *In what centuries did apocryphal writings exist in any considerable number? What is the most probable account of their origin?*

With Malachi, B.C. 430 (Mal. iv. 4-6), the canonical books of the Old Testament closed; and the chief apocryphal books were written between that period and the time of Christ. They are not quoted or referred to by any early Fathers of the first three centuries, or noticed in the New Testament, or mentioned by Philo, Josephus, or any Scriptural writer. They were not admitted as canonical by the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 366, which fixed the canon of Scripture, including both Testaments. No apocryphal writer lays claim to inspiration. They are useful, in shewing the care taken to exclude doubtful matter from the canon, and in delineating the state of religious sentiment among the Jews in the ages immediately preceding the time of the Messiah. Although Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus contain noble sentiments, they were never received by the Jews, or even known to them. The Apocrypha is rejected by Melito, Origen, Athanasius, and other orthodox writers, who have given catalogues of the canonical books. No apocryphal book exists in Hebrew; and the last book of Esdras is only in Latin. The Wisdom contradicts its own inspiration. St. Austin writes, that these books were called apocryphal because unknown to the Fathers of the first ages. St. Jerome calls all books apocryphal which are not genuine—not the works of the authors whose names they bear. They were never read in the church till the fourth century, and then not acknowledged as canonical. In general they contain much confusion and contradiction, and in the historical books anachronism and historical error. It is probable that after the death of Malachi,—when the Jews believed that some mode of divination, called *בֵּית קוֹל*, *the daughter of a voice*, by words heard or signs beheld, was substituted for the failure of prophecy, or for the *urim* and *thummim*, that is, oracular responses displayed by the high priest's breast-plate,—the apocryphal writings obtained a reputation for authenticity through the superstitious spirit then prevalent. But they contain no prophecies; are written after prophecy had ceased; and

do not pretend to inspiration. Besides the apocrypha often inserted in the Bible, there were other writings so named after the time of Christ. St. Luke opens his Gospel by stating, that many had taken in hand to set in order the things believed by the disciples. In the first, second, and third centuries, before authenticated catalogues of the canonical books of the New Testament were published, spurious volumes were introduced, under the name of gospels, acts, travels, or revelations,—many of which may have preserved authentic traditions respecting our Lord and his apostles; but these were mingled with improbable fictions, having been written by Gnostics (and some of them by Judaizing teachers), to promote their own views. And nothing can shew the care taken to separate the genuine from the spurious Scriptures, more than the growing reverence with which the former are upheld, treasured, and multiplied, compared with the oblivion which has swallowed up the latter. Burton's *Eccles. Hist. of Three First Centuries*, p. 204.

The Shepherd of Hermas was falsely ascribed to St. Paul; but was probably of the second century. Fabricius has collected specimens of these later apocryphal books.

Archbishop Lawrence has brought to light two books, which had been long lost. The first is the Book of Enoch, found by Bruce in Abyssinia. It had been referred to in Jude v. 14, 15; but had been lost since the eighth century. It is an early apocryphal book of the century before Christ, and a curious exposition of the state of Jewish belief in regard to mysterious doctrines of that age. The other MS., found likewise in Abyssinia, is the account of the pretended ascension of Isaiah, through six heavens, into the seventh; which Lawrence proves to be a work of the 68th or 69th year of our Lord.

Toland, and other infidels, have endeavoured to invalidate the authority of the genuine canonical books, by confounding them with these spurious volumes; but learned men have separated the wheat from the chaff; see Jones's *Canon of the New Testament*. These books are not cited or mentioned by the primitive Fathers, and by the later ones are rejected as forgeries, when they appeared in the second or third centuries. Internal evidence is also strong against these writings: they

contradict history and chronology ; their style is different from that of the genuine books. They are in some parts imitations of the true Scriptures, but with foolish and artful additions ; and are in many respects trifling and self-exposing.

They are written against heresies which arose after the apostolic age, and are themselves heretical in doctrine ; relating, for example, to the sanctity of relics, and the assumption of Mary. There is an artlessness, a simplicity of style and narrative in the New Testament which these spurious works cannot equal, and which defies their power of injuring the genuine ones. Far from injuring, they confirm the truth of the canonical Scripture, partly by acknowledging the divinity of Christ, and his power of working miracles ; partly by their clumsy enlargements of simple facts ; and partly by shewing the care, wisdom, and discernment of the first Christians in separating truth from imposition.

285. What are the most obvious proofs of the integrity of the canon of the Old Testament Scriptures ?

The canon is the authorised list of the inspired books, from which texts would be taken to support a doctrine. The canon of the Old Testament Scriptures is attributed to Ezra, himself no doubt acting under the influence of the Spirit. It was divided into the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa,—to which our Saviour refers, as all speaking of himself ; Luke (xxiv. 44) calling the Hagiographa (or holy writings) the *Psalms*, their principal book, as the others were Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. By the Law is meant the Pentateuch ; and by the Prophets, all the other books, viz. Job, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, four greater, and twelve minor prophets. This division was made in order to make the number of books tally with the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet. But afterwards the distribution was into twenty-four books : Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, were numbered with the *former* prophets ; and the Hagiographa included Job, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Ezra, Daniel, Esther, and Chronicles. With the famous division of twenty-two, Josephus, in his catalogue, agrees. “For

we have not an innumerable multitude of books like the Greeks, contradicting each other; but only twenty-two, which contain the records of all past time, and are fully believed to be divine. Five belong to Moses, embracing nearly 3000 years; thirteen, till the reign of Artaxerxes, were written by the prophets; and the remaining four contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of life." Whiston, vol. iv. pp. 286, 287.*

The Council of Carthage (A.D. 397) took in—though with marks of inferior reverence—some apocryphal books, which the Council of Trent confirmed, A.D. 1545. We have likewise the authority of the Septuagint version, a Greek translation of the Old Testament, made in Egypt by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, B.C. 277, which is continually quoted in the New Testament. We have stated, under the last Question (284), why the apocryphal writings should be excluded from the canon. Our Lord never referred to them, nor did his apostles; but on the books of Moses he stamps authority in Matt. iv. 4, 11, v. 17, 18, xxii. 23, 33, xxiv. 37, 39; Luke xvi. 27, 31, xvii. 26, 32; John iii. 14, 15, v. 39, 47. He authorises likewise the Old Testament in Matt. xii. 1, v. 41, 42, xxi. 15, 16, xxii. 41, 46, xiii. 13, 15, xii. 39, 41, xxiv. 15, ix. 13, xii. 7, xi. 10; Luke iv. 25, vii. 27, xxiv. 27, 44, 46; John v. 30, 40, x. 34, 35. The Pentateuch is the most ancient book in the world, preceding Orpheus by 200 years, and Homer and Hesiod by nearly 500. It accords with the philosophy of patriarchal times and manners; it explains the names and settlement of nations, and the origin of heathen mythology (see Wells' *Geography*, and Gale's *Court of the Gentiles*); it is not contradicted, but is rather confirmed, by improvements in science, for there is no evidence of *human* remains in the bowels of the earth beyond the time assigned for the creation of man by Moses; and geology, so far as it is a settled science, is at least a comment on the flood. Customs, which record miraculous events, are traced back to Moses; and if these events never happened, how did the cus-

* Jerome wrote to Læta, a Roman lady, respecting the religious education of her grand-daughter: "Let her read the Psalms as a manual of devotion, and the Proverbs as a lesson of piety; Ecclesiastes will teach her to trample on the vanities of life, and Job to triumph over its afflictions."

toms (*e.g.* the passover and Sabbath) arise? History has confirmed its predictions, and the Gospel has at once substantiated and spiritualised its types. Both Jewish and heathen writers attribute the Pentateuch to Moses; as do Philo, Josephus, Manetho, Eupolemus, Tacitus, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Justin, Juvenal, and others. These books could not have been compiled during the kings, for they condemned kingly government: nor since the separation of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, for the Samaritans acknowledge them. The remaining books also were always allowed to be genuine and authentic, except Daniel, which Porphyry failed in invalidating. The inspiration of the books of the Old Testament is proved by the prophecies they deliver, which were afterwards fulfilled, and the miracles they record, which other evidence confirms; by the excellence of the laws and precepts, among a people in other respects not endowed with talent to compose them; and by the purity of the religious system, amidst the idolatries and corruptions of the most enlightened nations. Our last proof is drawn from the testimony of our Saviour and his inspired apostles. In regard to an essential point of religion, our Saviour says, *If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead*; and when he enjoins the Jews to search the Scriptures, since in them there was eternal life, John v. 39, and these are they which testified of him; when he continually speaks of Scripture as applying to himself; when St. Paul declares that *all Scripture is given by inspiration of God*, 2 Tim. iii. 16; and that *God spake in time past by the prophets*, Heb. i. 1,—let us remember that it is the canonical books of the *Old Testament*, as held to be inspired by the Jews, that are spoken of. Moses forbids any to add to the Pentateuch, Deut. iv. 2; and it is of the Old Testament as well as the New, that both St. Paul (Gal. i. 8) and St. John (Rev. xxii. 18, 19) issue a like prohibition.

286. *Mankind having abused their natural powers, prove from thence the necessity of an extraordinary revelation.*

As we may not assume a revelation, or draw proofs from it before establishing its probability from other sources, we derive

the evidence of man's degeneracy from our observation of life and our own inward experience. Man was formed after the image of God, and his reason established in dominion over the baser elements of his nature; but it is manifest, from reflection, that this natural supremacy is lost. There is a law in our members warring against the law of our minds, and leading us into the bondage of sin, even against the decisions and remonstrances of reason: *Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor*, was the experience of a *heathen* poet, and is that of all mankind. There needed not scriptural proof to convince us, that the carnal mind is enmity against God, and that the things that we would not, those we do. This is contrary to the instincts of the lower animals, and peculiar to man—the abuse of reason in him who alone has the gift of reason. Our very disposition is adverse to the will of God, and obedience is with us *against the grain*. This inborn corruption shoots out in a variety of actual offences. We find ourselves overwhelmed with a load of sin, and unable of ourselves to break through its entanglements. *O wretched men that we are!* is our natural exclamation; *who shall deliver us from the body of this death?*

In this state we want two things: 1st, An adequate propitiation for the past, to reconcile us, guilty as we find ourselves, to a pure, heart-searching, and just God; and, 2d, A power to renew our disposition, to remould and fashion us, frail as we by nature are, into some resemblance to the Divine image we have effaced, and to replace the spiritual volitions in something of their original superiority over the animal corruptness we experience. It is highly probable that a merciful God would provide two such remedies for the evils of a fallen nature; and if he should, that he should acquaint us with them. This is the extraordinary revelation required. He tells his creatures, that the Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head; and he assures them, that he will put in them a new heart and a new spirit, and, forgetting their sins and iniquities, in such as turn to him with repentance and faith, he will enable them to yield such service as, through the Saviour, will be accepted. Again, entire obedience in all points, and for the whole of life, having become hopeless and impracticable, and happiness having been

promised to nothing else, it is reasonable to suppose that God would reveal to man with what kind or degree of imperfect obedience he would be satisfied, and point out the mode in which access was yet open to his throne. And all this became the more likely, as men, left to themselves, and conscious of their own unworthiness, actually sought atonement for sin in bodily self-mortifications, and in unmeaning sacrifices and superstitious rites. It was reasonable that God should set before them the only true and effectual atonement, and acquaint them that he is a Spirit, and would be approached in spirit and in truth.

Two things would be necessary in such a revelation: 1st, It must shew itself to be a revelation by miracles; for whether God should personally speak—as Jehovah spake to Moses—or by a deviation from the established course of nature, shewing his power and manifesting his will, such assurance would necessarily be miraculous. 2d, The different position of man, now unfit to lift up his eyes to heaven, and a creature alienated from his former position of undeviating obedience, as giving a claim (by promise) to eternal life, would render a new covenant necessary. The covenant of works, then, was replaced by a covenant of grace, in which God looked to the righteousness of his Son, and to man as accepted in that beloved Saviour, on the conditions of personal faith and repentance.

Even the first intimation to man, *yet unfallen*, respecting his duties, his destiny, and his relation to God, was, in his ignorance, a necessary revelation; but when man had fallen—failing in his duties, forfeiting his high destinies, and violating his relation to God,—how much more necessary became an extraordinary revelation adapted to this new situation, by opening to him a way of reconciliation, by medicating the general corruption of his nature, and by abating the merited curse, *Thou shalt die*.

287. *In what place in Europe did St. Paul first preach the Gospel, and with what success?*

This question has been already answered. Philippi had the honour of being the first European city in which Paul first proclaimed the glad tidings of salvation, Acts xvi., A. D. 50. He converted Lydia of Thyatira in a suburban proseucha, by the

side of a river; and when, with Silas, he was cast into prison, for commanding the spirit of divination to go out of a certain damsel, he proclaimed salvation by faith to the jailor, who believed with all his house: this was to preach the Gospel. Paul *again* visited Philippi A.D. 57, Acts xx. 6. Philippi, the first fruits of conversion in Europe, was conspicuous for its liberality, supplying St. Paul's necessities and those of the Asiatic saints, while other churches were backward in their contributions; aids which that apostle experienced at Thessalonica, Corinth, and Rome, and which he thankfully and affectionately acknowledges in the 4th chapter of his Epistle to the Philippians, A.D. 62. This epistle was appropriately the first epistle printed in embossed letters in Europe for the use of the *physically* blind, as the writer and apostle here first addressed the *spiritually* blind.

288. *Give the history of Timothy.*

Timothy, the son of a Greek or Gentile father, but of a Jewish mother named Eunice, had been trained from a child by the latter, and by his grandmother Lois, in a knowledge of the ancient Scriptures, and in the wisdom unto salvation which they teach; for both of which qualifications he attracted the notice and received the commendation of St. Paul, 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15. He was of Derbe or Lystra, contiguous cities of Lycaonia, Acts xiv. 6; where St. Paul arriving, A.D. 51 or 52, and finding him well reported of by the brethren of these parts, chose him as a fellow-labourer in the Gospel, having previously directed him to be circumcised, in compliance with the prejudices of the Jews, who would have objected to his being half a Gentile, Acts xvi. 3.

Paul had ever afterwards an affectionate esteem for Timothy, associating him with himself in the salutations of his epistles—longing to be present with him—calling him his dear son in the faith,—and remembering him in his prayers night and day, 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15. Timothy was ordained by Paul, in consequence of some prophetic intimations from heaven, as we find in 1 Tim. iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6. Timothy accompanied Paul to Macedonia, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea. Paul here left

him with Silas, to confirm the brethren; and proceeded to Athens, where he invited this favourite disciple to join him, Acts xvii. 14-16. From Athens, Paul sent him back to Thessalonica; but rejoining the apostle at Corinth, A.D. 52, and afterwards at Athens, he sends his salutation to this honoured church in the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, Acts xviii. 5. In A.D. 56, Timothy was again sent, with Erastus, into Macedonia, Acts xix. 21, 22; and afterwards went thither with Paul himself, whence they wrote together to the Corinthians, A.D. 57, as they did from Corinth to the Romans (Rom. xvi. 21) in the same year. We again find Timothy as the companion of Paul in Rome, A.D. 60-62; as adding his name to that of the apostle in the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon; and he is spoken of in Heb. xiii. 23 as having come out of prison. In A.D. 64, St. Paul left Timothy at Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3, 4, ii. 1, 8, 9, iii. 1, 8, vii. 20), to govern that church as its first bishop, Paul himself going on to Macedonia, whence he addressed his first epistle to this son in the faith, counselling him not to suffer abstemiousness to injure his health, but to take a little wine for the stomach's sake, 1 Tim. vi. 23, A.D. 64 or 65. The second epistle to Timothy was written from Rome, A.D. 65—a most affectionate and solemn charge, when the apostle was in prospect of martyrdom, which he endured A.D. 66. Timothy is said to have governed the church of Ephesus till A.D. 97, and to have there suffered martyrdom. He is probably the angel of the church of Ephesus addressed by St. John, Rev. ii. 1-3. Early ecclesiastical writers furnish other particulars respecting Timothy, who is said to have been succeeded by Onesimus.

289. *What qualifications are necessary in order to judge rightly of religious matters?*

I. To judge rightly on religious subjects, the first qualification necessary is *humility*: we must be penetrated by a profound sense of the loftiness and difficulty of the theme, and of the caution and diffidence with which a finite being ought to approach to the study of infinitude. If we can hardly attain to a knowledge of earthly things, how shall we hope, in our present state, fully to understand heavenly things? We must resolve to

be satisfied with information far short of mathematical evidence, considering that there are many points of the Divine character and dealings which we know not now, but shall know hereafter, and which, by now exciting and yet baffling comprehension, afford promise of an hereafter. We must think of God as vouchsafing such information here below as is sufficient to guide us to heaven, but not to indulge our vain curiosity. A future state of being is assigned for our perfect knowledge; and we have only here to expect such lights and such helps as may support faith in the way to eternity; *for here we see through a glass darkly*, (or, as the original expresses it, "look into a dim mirror in an enigma;") *but then* (in futurity) *we shall know as we are known*, and see face to face.

II. Life is probation, as an exercise not only of obedience, but of *faith*, and therefore to humility must be added this quality. Faith is a disposition to realise, on adequate testimony, the things hoped for and unseen. A consciousness of our blindness, and of the errors of men under the light of nature, ought to prepare us for revelation, by shewing its necessity, its probability, its reasonableness; as it is fair to suppose that the Creator would communicate to his creatures a knowledge of what he intends for them, and what he requires at their hands: * in other words, of their destinies and their duties. The natural light of conscience goes but a little way in ascertaining these points; and if God do give clearer information, he must give it supernaturally. Thus, then, amidst all our doubts and difficulties, we have one stay to cling to—the written word of God; for we know that he is truth, and have sufficient evidence that Scripture comes from him; and we know, on the joint authority of reason and revelation, that his promises are yea and amen, and that he is faithful who hath promised.

III. A third qualification necessary to the investigation of religious subjects is, *simplicity of intention* and *godly sincerity*: we must have no sinister, self-idolising view, but be solely actuated by the love of truth. Even should truth convict us of guilt—bring low our pride of thought—humble our assumptions of virtue in the dust—check our unruly passions—rein our indulgences—call for the most painful sacrifices,—we must be

content and eager to face it. We must beware of a captious, querulous, disputatious spirit, for that is *pride*; as well as of a self-deluding, qualifying disposition to bend truth to an accommodation with the evil principles of our nature, for that is *passion*; and both pride and passion are the great obstacles to the discovery of truth.

IV. *Candour* may be added as another requisite to the right study of religious subjects. We must beware of prejudice, and not object to truth because it may come from an unwelcome quarter. Though, on a *general* subject, we may espouse the right side, there are yet particular points in which truth lies with our adversary, and these we ought to adopt. A poor man remonstrating, may be censured for the liberty he takes; and yet there may be truth in what he urges, which ought to be treasured. We ought patiently to hear our antagonist's defence of his own principles, and to answer them by reason, and not by persecution. Our only *bias* ought ever to be on the side of that religious proposition which is most conformable to the moral attributes of God, and to the promotion of the cause of personal holiness.

V. This introduces and suggests the last qualification requisite to the right study of religious matters—and that is *personal holiness*, the qualification essential to all the others. *I will wash my hands in innocency, and so will I approach thine altar*, or study thy perfections and proceedings; for if any one cherished transgression yet remains in the heart, it will spread its shadow over the judgment: self-love, and averseness from self-humiliation, will seek to justify or extenuate the offence retained, and this will infallibly give a wrong bias to its inquiries, and a false direction to its decisions. It will close with that as truth which, in its consequences, leads to laxity; and that as falsehood or error, which is the most stringent in its exactions—both judgments being unfavourable to a right decision. *For this is the condemnation, that men love DARKNESS rather than LIGHT, because their deeds are evil.* Flesh and blood will always take care that the religion it chooses as that of truth will never bear too hard upon itself. Against plain and even inspired dictates, will be set extravagant views of the mercy of God, to the exclusion

of his other attributes, — or comfortable views of the harmlessness of sin, — and these will tincture all other reasonings of the unrenewed man.

In conclusion, these qualifications demand the auxiliary aid of prayer, and the guard of strict watchfulness.

290. Prove God to be omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent.

1. God is *omnipotent*. The great First Cause must rule all effects; and he is the omnipotent God, because he is the *only* God. To say that any thing could successfully resist his power, is to say that there is another independent power, that is, another god.

The omnipotence of God is displayed in the creation of the whole inanimate universe. Those millions of stars, at almost immeasurable distances in the vast ocean of infinitude, — every one of which is a sun, and the centre of a system, in all probability peopled with life, — and all of which exist in an analogy and harmony which proclaims their having come forth from one hand; so that to say, he created the earth and solar system, is to make him the creator and sustainer of all the suns and systems in the milky way, and of all the nebulae, in each of which eighty millions of suns have been computed. Yet the same hand made the minutest individual in any of those clouds of insects which warp upon the east wind; all of which, by their uniform structure and resemblance to each other, shew again the might of the creating arm. Need we infer that power to be *omnipotent*? Nor is his omnipotence less manifest in *upholding* than in creating all things. He works, it is true, by instruments, like the wheels of a watch, but he is still the unseen guide of these blind agencies. Deism might say, that he establishes general laws for the preservation of the universe, and, in an epicurean indolence, leaves them unconcernedly to their own working, — and even here his power would be displayed; for he hath made a tabernacle for the sun, and set bounds to the ocean; and the continuance of all things in their place, course, and order, would prove the general power of preservation.

Yet it would argue imperfection in God, to deny his personal and immediate superintendence of all the works of his hands, and a cognisance of their immediate wants and dangers. It would curtail his omnipotence, to think that a breath could be drawn without him, or a possibility remain of any thing going wrong in his absence. His power is seen in *destruction*: he could extinguish an universe as easily as he called it into being, or as he preserves worlds in their constant revolutions, or refreshes them with the showers of heaven. And thus, whether we think of systems or tribes in the mass, or of the meanest individual creature, the law of mortality is an unceasing and universal memento of omnipotence. It is universal; it is appointed unto all men once to die, *i. e.* to all living creatures; and in God's hands are the issues of life and death. The omnipotence of God would be fully proved by natural religion, even if it went no farther than the acting by general laws, for these laws are uniform in all the detached portions of the universe, and manifest one Architect—of absolute power.

But the power of God is shewn in the microscope of revelation, as setting casualty at defiance, and descending to individual objects. Without him not a sparrow falls to the ground; not even the existence of evil, so abhorrent to the nature of God, disproves his omnipotence. It exists by his permission, and for the wise purpose of probation to his rational creatures. *I create evil*, saith the Lord himself, Is. xlv. 7. *The Lord hath made all things for himself, yea even the wicked for the day of evil*, Prov. xvi. 4. Not that God MAKES wicked men, for he cannot be the *author* of evil; but he can permit the evil spirit to take advantage of their wilful depravity, and give it a turn to subserve the agency of his providence; he can set the wicked up as the instruments of his power in exterminating or punishing his enemies, like our Lord using the whip of cords he had found in the Temple; and when that object is accomplished, he can check their career, with a *Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther*; put a hook into their nose, restrain the remainder of their wrath, and reserve them to the day of their penitence, or of his own inflexible justice; see Question 237. Well may we say indeed, *Such knowledge* (in

its full extent) *is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain to it*, Ps. cxxxix. 6; yet we cannot deny it, and must therefore join the hymns of glorified spirits, *Hallelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth*, Rev. xix. 6. God is always called in Scripture all-powerful. *Thine is the power*, is the attribute which supposes and gives unlimited extent to all the others. He is the *Lord God almighty*, Rev. iv. 8, 1 Cor. i. 26, and with him *all things are possible*, Mark x. 27. But as there are no bounds to his power, man has no full conception of it. *Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is high as heaven, what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea; Job xi. 7-9. Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance. Behold, the nations are as a drop of the bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing; Is. xl. 12, 15.*

What a God to offend! what a power to provoke! We breathe his air, and he can taint it; it is his health we enjoy, and he can withhold it. The whole artillery of the universe is in his hand. He is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, without at his pleasure removing it. It is of his tender mercies that we are not consumed by his power; and what are we—what is man? a worm, a sinful thing,—that such a Being is mindful of him? It is of his chief mercy, his Son, that we have life and hope.

2. *God is omniscient.* Perhaps it would be more advisable to settle the question of God's omnipresence first, for his omnipresence without his spiritual personality is pantheism, and pantheism is atheism; but these two attributes together constitute omniscience; omniscience is the omnipresence of an intelligent personality. If any thing limited the knowledge of God, he would be an imperfect being; and the limit of his knowledge would be the limit of his power, which has been already proved to be illimitable. Here, however, our present comprehension is

as imperfect as in the case of his omnipotence. The mind of God embraces all things, past, present, and to come; and all not successively, but at one glance. To connect his prescience with our free agency, is a mystery which we pretend not to solve. We feel, however, that we have some free agency, and content ourselves with reposing on his wisdom, justice, and mercy. Any one attribute of God has no limit but that of his other attributes. We, ignorant and imperfect as we are, can suppose divine prescience without supposing a decree of reprobation on individuals from all eternity; God may foresee what course my free agency will take, without condemning me *à priori* to destruction. But no passage of Scripture can contradict another; and there must be some way of explaining a seeming contradiction, so that it shall not neutralise a positive declaration. Now it is a positive declaration, that God is not WILLING, much less decrees, that any should perish, but wills all men to come unto eternal life. All the exhortations to repentance in Scripture, with all the promises of forgiveness, imply the same truth. Nothing, then, can be true which seems to contradict this.

The omniscience of God is proved by Scripture. *The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good*, Prov. xv. 3. *Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight*, Heb. iv. 13. *He is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart*, Heb. iv. 12: *all things are naked and open unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do*. How ought we to walk, in deed and in thought, before this great Searcher of hearts! How, in temptation, ought the reflection of Hagar to rise up to our mind like a guardian angel—*Thou, Lord, seest me!* Gen. xvi. 13. How ought we to denominate the desert-spring, the mountain-cave, the remotest solitude, the loneliest chamber—Beer-lahairoi, the (spiritual) well of him that liveth and seeth me! Gen. xvi. 14.

How affecting a display of the omniscience of God will take place at the day of judgment, when he, unto whom all hearts be now open, shall disclose the secrets of all hearts—when every idle word, now heard by that invisible witness, shall be accounted for; and they who refused to have their thoughts cleansed by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, will stand

trembling before the eternal throne! Christ is to be the judge (Acts xvii. 31)—the *man* appointed by God, the most fitted for the office: in his Divinity, the Searcher of all hearts; in his humanity, tempted, thus knowing to compassionate the tempted, Heb. ii. 18. But he comes clothed in all the attributes of divinity, and his omniscience qualifies him as a competent judge. *I saw thee when thou wast under the fig-tree*, will he say to the abashed sinner, John i. 48. The sincere Christian, once perhaps distrusted and suspected of duplicity, will then say with confidence, Lord, *thou knewest all things, thou knewest that I loved thee*; and all will exclaim, some with gladness, and some in the agonies of despair, in the language of the woman of Samaria, *Here is one who can tell us all things that ever we did: is not this the Christ?* John iv. 29.

3. *God is omnipresent.* The omniscience of God implies his omnipresence; for it is not that of a king enthroned in one part of his dominions, and either taking a telescopic survey, or receiving account from subordinate intelligence (except for the support of his state), of the transactions of every remote district; but that of a Spirit, filling all space. The omnipresence of God is not the pervasion of the universe by an *anima mundi*. It is not the mere diffusion of spirit, as animating matter and distinguished from it. It is not the thing which philosophers call *nature*; for "Nature is but another name for an effect, of which the cause is God;" Cowper. It is not even Lord Bacon's spirit of the universe, descending in a fertilising shower. It is not the unintelligible and profane

"Jupiter est quodcunque vides, quocunque moveris."

It is not the god of Lucretius, Bolingbroke, and other infidels: it is the self-existent *Maker* of that stupendous whole, of which these writers have said,

"—— Whose body nature is, and God the soul;
That, changed through all, and yet in all the same,
Great in the earth as in th' ethereal frame,
Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glowes in the stars, and blossoms in the trees;
Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unspent."

To make this living principle God, to set up an omnipresence without intelligence or personality, is pure pantheism, and would go the length of making the devils themselves, and the wicked, a *part* of God. No; God is the Being who supplied this living principle, who breathed into our nostrils the breath of life,—and not that breath of life itself. His omnipresence is the universal presence of a personal intelligence—of a moral governor of the universe—of one conscious of the secrets of every individual, and by whom every individual shall be judged; *for every man must give an account of himself to God*, Rom. xiv. 12. This is the personal God, of whom the Scriptures speak in sublimity. *Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there: if I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost part of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, Peradventure the darkness shall cover me, then shall the night be turned to day: yea, there is no darkness with thee, the night is as clear as the day; the darkness and light are both alike to thee*, Ps. cxxxix. 7-12. *The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good*, Prov. xv. 3. *Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him, saith God?* Jer. xxiii. 23, 24. This doctrine is fraught with joy to the devout, consolation to the afflicted, resignation to the unjustly aspersed, and terror to the guilty. God marks every pious aspiration, every hidden self-denial, every devout affection, every secret prayer, every wish to exercise charity, even when the power is wanting; and he that seeth in secret will reward his worshippers openly. He numbers every sigh that is heaved, and treasures up the tears of the afflicted; he is present in all their sorrows, which come not by chance, for he, in his wisdom, inflicts them. His ears are open to the cry of the poor destitute, and his hand, when they cry unto him, will bind up their wounds. He observes his servants *suffering under a load of unjust obloquy*, either through a combination of circumstances, or the malice of evil men; and a time is coming when he will announce their character in its true light, and bring forth their judgment as the noon-day. Lastly, he accompanies

in terror the guilty in all their deeds of darkness; he is about their path and about their bed, and spieth out all their ways; and an hour approacheth, when they will feel that they cannot flee from his avenging arm, but will cry in vain to the mountains, *Fall on us, and to the hills, Cover us, and hide us, if it be possible, from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?* Rev. vi. 16, 17.

291. Οἱ χρώμενοι τῷ κόσμῳ ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι, 1 Cor. vii. 31: *what is the sense of the word καταχρώμενοι? Would a Greek writer have used any other word in the meaning given in our version?*

Χράσμαι and καταχράσμαι have the same signification, *κατά* being *intensive*. The verse would have been better translated, "they who use this world, as though they *used* it not;" instead of our version, "as not abusing it." A Greek writer, meaning to say "abusing it," would have written ἀποχρώμενοι.

292. *Prove the Socinian doctrine to be unscriptural.*

The principle of Socinianism—of which modern rationalism is the spawn—is, that every doctrine of revealed religion ought to be tried by the test of reason; and hence its chief doctrine of the strict Unity of God as excluding a Trinity. The Word and Holy Spirit are deemed by the disciples of Socinus to be attributes of the one Supreme Being. Christ is held to be a highly honoured *man*, appointed to preach and to die for a pure and spiritual religion, and to teach the doctrine of a future state by rising on the third day after his interment. On account of this high office, he may be called by an idiom, "the son of God;" but his literal and true title is, the "son of man." It conceives that Christ was received into heaven before the commencement of his ministry, and there instructed in those truths which he afterwards delivered to the world. Thus Socinus contrived to meet the texts which contradicted his chief doctrines.

Unitarianism denies all this latter part of the Socinian creed,

and conceives our Saviour to be a mere man, peccable and fallible, and not to be worshipped in any sense. They deny his atonement—the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost—and the inspiration of Scripture. They are more consistent than the Socinians—who offer worship to Christ, and yet allow him to be a man and a created being; not considering that the only object of worship is God. The Socinians may be reasoned with from *Scripture*, because they admit the major proposition, viz. that it is inspired, and is perfect truth; though they deny the minor, that the divinity of Christ may be gathered from it.

We have here to shew—I. The personality of the Word, or second Being in the Trinity. II. His pre-existence. III. His Divinity. And the same of the Holy Ghost.

I. The *personality* of the Son and Holy Ghost was manifested at the baptism of Christ. When *Jesus* entered into the water, the *Spirit* hovered over him like a dove, and the voice of the *Father* was heard saying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*, Matt. iii. 16, 17, Luke iii. 22. John (i. 33) says that God directed the Baptist to *Jesus*, as the Person on whom, *before* the baptism, he should see the Holy Ghost descending and *remaining*—which precludes all idea of the *voice* coming from the *Spirit*, or of the testimony to the descent of the *Spirit* being the assertion of *Jesus himself*. Matthew assigns the testimony of Christ—John that of the Baptist—Luke states the fact, that it descended; Matt. iii. 16, Luke iii. 22, John i. 32, 33. And they all fulfil two prophecies of Isaiah: *the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him*, xi. 2; and, *I will put my Spirit upon him*, xlii. 1. Again, when our Saviour was about to leave the world, he tells his apostles, *And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you ANOTHER Comforter, even the Spirit of truth; and he shall guide you into all truth*, John xiv. 16, 17: *another* Comforter; therefore not the same Person with the Son: sent *from* the Father; therefore not the same Person with the Father. And *when the Comforter is come, whom I will send you FROM the Father—even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth FROM the Father*, is another passage shewing distinct personality in the three members of the Trinity; John xv. 26: here the Spirit, τὸ πνεῦμα, is neuter, and the pro-

noun *ἐκείνος*, *he*, is masculine ; which it would not have been, had the Spirit been only an emanation, or ray, or influence, and not a person. Burton, vol. i. p. 404 ; Bloomfield, vol. ii. p. 281. And again, Ephes. i. 14, τὸ πνεῦμα ὃς : and once more, *If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you ; but if I depart, I will send him unto you* (John xvi. 7) : Christ the *Son* sends him. These are all passages to the same effect.

An intercessor is between two persons. God the Father, and man, are the two persons ; the Spirit is the *intercessor*, and therefore a different person from either of the two interceded with ; Rom. viii. 26. But Christ is likewise the intercessor, Heb. vii. 25 ; and therefore *he* is a different person from the Father, as he is from the Spirit, whom he says he will send, as *another* Paraclete or Advocate. There are then three Persons, and yet not three Gods ; for Christ saith, *I and the Father are one*, John x. 30 : and as to the Spirit, our Saviour identifies himself with the *other* Comforter in saying, *Me ye have not always* (Mark xiv. 7), as the personal Son ; and yet, *Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world* (Matt. xxviii. 20), as identified with the personal Spirit.

Thus we avoid at once the errors of Socinianism and Sabelianism. All the appearances of Jehovah in the Old Testament are attributed to the Son, or λόγος : *Thou art the Lord the God*, Nehem. ix. 7 ; and, ver. 13, *Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai*. The angel who wrestled with Jacob was Jehovah,—for he wrestled with God, Gen. xxxii. 28, 30 ; and, *he is the Angel of God's presence, who saved the Israelites*, Isa. lxiii. 9. At the creation, *the Word was with God, and by him all things were made* ; and *the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters*. And when God said, *Let us make man in our own image*, he calls a council of the sacred Three. So again, when the birth of our Lord was announced, *the angel said to Mary, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, therefore the holy thing to be born shall be called the Son of God*. Here all the three Persons are engaged, and their Divinity at the same time established.

II. We must now, secondly, prove the *pre-existence* of Christ, against the Socinians, who consider him a mere man, born naturally of Mary ; though by some allowed to have been

caught up into heaven *after* this natural birth, to be instructed of God in heavenly matters.

This hypothesis (although it be allowing *one* miracle, and is rejected by the great body of the Unitarians) might explain the text, *and no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven*, John iii. 13; although we should be puzzled to reconcile the remaining words to the humanity of Christ, *even the Son of man, which is in heaven*; or 1 Cor. xv. 47, *the second man is the Lord FROM heaven*; or Ephes. iv. 9, *now he that ascended, what is it but that he descended first εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς?* For although the older commentators refer this to hades, and some to the grave, yet Bishop Pearson (*on the Creed*, p. 229) and other great divines explain the words "the lower regions," and as importing the incarnation of Christ and his descent on earth. The apostle's argument is, that if Christ ascended into heaven, he must have first come from heaven upon earth; and indeed the Jews themselves believed in the original abode of their Messiah as being in heaven. But how would such an accommodation explain the answer of our Lord to the Pharisees, *Before Abraham was, I am?* John viii. 58. How would it explain the word *Elohim* in the plural, expressive of God? not, as the Jews and Socinians say, as a word of dignity, though used by one person, as a king in a proclamation calls himself *we*, but attached to a verb in the singular, as a king never uses it. How would it explain the introduction to St. John's Gospel, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him, &c.*

As to the rash notion of Socinianism respecting the man Jesus being caught up before his baptism into heaven, to be instructed, it is answered by a consideration drawn from Colos. ii. 3, *Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge*, which were displayed so early as his twelfth year, Luke ii. 42; and by Ephes. iv. 9, where it is said he *first* DESCENDED.

As man, indeed, he might be beholden to his earthly parents for secular instruction, as for food; but if in him were hid all treasures of wisdom, there was no occasion for his being caught

up into heaven for instruction. *This is he that came down from heaven*, where he had been before the worlds were made.

III. Having proved the triple Personality in one nature, and the pre-existence of the Son and Holy Ghost previous to the introduction of the Gospel, it remains that we shew the Divinity of each of these separate Persons. With respect to the Son, we find (in John i. 1) that the *λόγος was with God, and was God*; and in John x. 30, *I and my Father are one*: in Acts xx. 28, *the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood*; and in Romans ix. 5, *Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever*: in Tit. ii. 13, *looking for the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ*, where the absence of the article before *σωτήρος ἡμῶν*, makes the sense, “our great God and Saviour,” as in many other places (Burton): in 1 John ii. 2, 3, *whosoever denieth the Son hath not the Father*: 1 John iii. 16, *hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us*: in 1 John v. 20, *this (Jesus Christ) is the true God and everlasting life*: 2 John, v. 9, *whosoever abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God*: in Rev. i. 8, *I am Alpha and Omega, saith the Lord the Almighty*: and Rev. xix. 13, 16, *the Word of God, ὁ λόγος, King of kings, and Lord of lords*. And here the Old Testament harmonises with the New: in Isa. ix. 6, the name of the Child to be born, the Messiah, was to be *the mighty God, the everlasting Father*; and in Isa. ix. 14. The Divinity of the third Person, the Holy Ghost, may be further proved from Acts v. 3, 4, where Peter tells Ananias that *he had lied to the Holy Ghost*, or, in the next verse, *to God*.

But the best method of shewing the Divinity of the three Persons is by demonstrating, that attributes or qualities which belong to God alone are severally and separately assigned to the Son and the Holy Spirit. To be “everlasting” is applied to God alone, Rom. xvi. 25, 26; but Jesus saith, *I am the first and the last*, Rev. xxii. 13; and the Holy Spirit is called the *everlasting Spirit*, Heb. ix. 14. God alone is “omnipresent,” Jer. xxiii. 24; yet Christ *filleth all in all*, Ephes. i. 23; and David asks, *Whither shall I flee from thy SPIRIT?* God is “Creator,” Gen. i. 1; yet John tells us, that by the Son, or *λόγος, all things were made*, John i. 3; and Job says, *The*

SPIRIT of God hath made me, xxxiii. 4. God is the only object of worship, Exod. xx. 3, 5, Matt. iv. 10; yet when the Father bringeth the only begotten Son into the world, he saith, *Let all the angels worship him*, Heb. i. 6. And the song of "Holy, holy, holy," addressed to the three Persons, gives worship to the Spirit, Isa. vi. 3, Rev. iv. 8. Omniscience and omnipotence may be shewn to belong to all the three Persons.

So baptism in the name (*ὀνόματι*)—not *names*—of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, proves their co-equality as members of that covenant, and establishes a Trinity.

293. *What do you suppose to be meant by such terms as these: a statute for ever—a law throughout all generations?*

As these phrases, wherever they occur in Exodus and Leviticus, relate either to the priesthood or the sacrifices of the Levitical law, they are to be limited by the condition, as long as that law shall last—as long as that preparatory dispensation shall continue. Some of these statutes, such as the feast of tabernacles, &c. (Lev. xxiii. 41), still continue to be observed by the Jews, although their polity is abolished, the sacrifices are no longer offered, and the genealogy of their priesthood is lost. Or again, the law being spiritualised in the Gospel, the letter that killeth giving place to the spirit that giveth life; all the sacrifices may have a spiritual meaning as applicable to the heart, and Christians are made priests unto God; while the great High-priest, offering the one sacrifice, may be said to have fulfilled and perpetuated the law.

294. *Shew that, though a national covenant could only be established in temporal promises of public and visible blessings, yet in God's covenant with the Jews there is a spiritual meaning, which was understood by David and the holy men in that dispensation.*

If a national covenant between God and any people were founded in PRIVATE blessings, it could not embrace a whole people in their collective capacity; for the wicked, who failed

in those obligations which constituted their part of the covenant, would not be entitled to the blessings promised to *general* obedience; and, on the other hand, a general rejection would seem unjust to those, more or fewer, who observed their part of the covenant. When God addresses Israel in the Old Testament in the word *thou*, he speaks to the whole nation: *Thou art a rebellious people*. And an obedient nation flourishing, or a rebellious nation falling, would include the idolatrous exceptions in the former case, and the 7000 who bowed not the knee to Baal in the latter. Miracles wrought for the exceptions in either case, which would unnecessarily disturb the course of events, leave no exercise for faith, and thus change the nature of the covenant, making it no longer national. God, in his dealings with *nations* must deal with them as *nations*, and reward or punish them temporally, including the righteous with the wicked. This, if this were the only life, or the most important part of existence, would be unjust, and liable to the imputation of God's being less just than man. It is, therefore, one proof of a future state, wherein these necessary irregularities will be rectified, the hills brought low, and the valleys exalted; when communities shall be split into atoms, and national covenants abolished, and every individual shall be judged according to his own works: *then every man shall give an account of himself unto God*, Rom. xiv. 12. Not only with the Jews, then, but with every nation, there is a national covenant, by which righteousness exalteth a nation, and sin is a reproach to any people. But as to individuals, God makes little account of the present life, and only looks to their welfare in eternity. This explains Solomon's aphorism, *The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong*, that is, here, and to individuals; although diligence has generally the promise of the life that now is. Yet God does not therefore part with his justice; he has a time in reserve, when *every* man shall have his due praise of God. But the blessings of a national covenant must be *visible*, as well as public, both on account of the people who are the subject of it, and likewise of their enemies.

The spiritual blessings of a covenant are, peace of mind here, and eternal *happiness hereafter*. But sinners may deceive

themselves into a false peace at present, and the future happiness is a matter of FAITH and of remote occurrence; and thus both are applicable to individuals, but cannot form the basis of a national covenant—the blessings of which must be visible and marked, and immediately resulting from the fulfilment of the conditions, in order to shew, especially to a carnal people, their substantiality, and the faithfulness of him that promised. If they were not thus visible and near, the infidelity of the human heart would disbelieve them, or its pride and depravity would put off the evil day of their realisation, and deny them to belong to a *national* covenant. As an example and a warning to other nations, any blessings not visible would be lost. The religion which spake of them would be derided. Men must see palpable interpositions in support of a national covenant, and sometimes even miracles of present recompense or punishment wrought for the present preservation or chastisement of the people said to be in covenant. They must see the sea parted to afford them a passage, and food provided in a wilderness for forty years, and idolatrous nations falling before their conquering sword, in order to believe, either with awe or confidence, that there is a God who judgeth in the earth, and that all the pretended idols called gods, in whom they trust, including the idol of expedience, are no gods. Nevertheless, though public, visible, and temporal retribution was thus necessary to a national covenant, almost every thing in the covenant of God with the Jews was spiritual; and though its spiritual meaning was hidden to a dull people, slow of apprehension, it was well understood by holy men, and chiefly by David, under the Levitical dispensation. When David said, *Sacrifice and burnt-offering thou wouldest not, but a body thou hast prepared me: lo, I come to do thy will, O God*, (Ps. xl. 6, 7), he cannot be supposed to deny the use of sacrifices, which he knew that God actually *would*, or desired, because God had *ordained* them; but he knew, 1st, that they pointed forward to a great sacrifice, Christ, who should set them all aside; and that, in other respects, they only signified an inward purifying, without which they were mere formalities; while the true sacrifices of God were a contrite spirit. When he spake of Christ as a priest for ever after the order of Mel-

chisedec, he saw in the legal priesthood only a preparatory or intermediate ordinance, introducing the one High-priest, who should supersede that typical ministry. From the brazen laver he learned the lesson, to approach the altar of God with clean hands and a pure heart,—the outward sign betokening an inward grace. He knew that prophets, priests, and kings, were anointed for their several offices with oil—that Elisha received this outward symbol from Elijah, and Jehu from the same hand—and that Aaron sustained a copious effusion, which moistened his beard, and *ran down to the skirts of his clothing*;—yet he could represent his Messiah as anointed with the *oil of gladness above his fellows*, and thus anticipated the fluttering of the Spirit over his head, which designated him as one anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power.

Although St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews and other writings, saw more clearly, and explained more fully, after Christ had appeared, the spiritual meaning of the legal ordinances as developed in his religion, yet we must remember that he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, and had learned in the school of that rabbin the rudiments of that spiritual signification of the ancient covenant, which his own master-mind reduced to a system. He must have known, from long tradition, that circumcision, an ordained rite, intimated a circumcision of the heart; that the lamb without spot betokened a spotless Messiah, and an unblemished holiness; that this life is a wilderness-state, wherein men seek a country; and in the change of the shifting tabernacle into the durable temple, that if our *earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens*. Though Christ brought life and immortality to light, yet a resurrection from the dead was known to the Jews before he came; as appears from some of the apocryphal books, from the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and other passages of the Old and New Testament: *unto which hope, the twelve tribes, instantly serving God night and day, sought to come*. That the Messiah was generally expected before the time of Christ, is an admitted fact; but as his grandeur, power, and conquests, were portrayed in the customary imagery of earthly splendour, in

order to adapt the descriptions to the comprehensions of a carnal people, the multitude looked not beyond the literal description; but the real grandeur of humility, and the unwarlike nature of his conquests, were known to Isaiah, when he describes him as baring his back to the smiters; to Zechariah, who announced him as meek and lowly, coming on an ass's colt; and to David, when he wrote the 22d Psalm. The whole of the 11th chapter to the Hebrews describes the patriarchs, judges, kings, and prophets, as animated by a faith which looked beyond the mere letter of the legal covenant.

295. Why was that which is not moral in its own nature, or had no relation to civil society, imposed on the Jews by the law of Moses?

It was necessary to insulate the Jews from surrounding nations, that they might preserve, amidst universal idolatry, the knowledge of the one true God, until, in the wisdom of God, the fulness of time for the last revelation should come; and the object of some laws and ordinances, was to make that insulation the more sure and complete. Even in the Babylonish captivity, the captives refused, at the command of their conquerors, to sing the songs of Zion; and a bitter spirit against their enemies was connived at, to prevent intermixture of races. Such close alliances would confound the genealogies of the tribe of Judah, from which the Shiloh or Messiah was confidently expected. Hence in Persia it was said of the Jews, "there is a people dispersed among the people in all the provinces of the kingdom, and their laws are diverse from all people."

Some ordinances were enjoined to widen the abhorrence of the Jews against the idolatries of Egypt, such as the red heifer; and some to keep up the memorial of important events, before written records were common. This last was the case with the passover, and with the stones set up at Gilgal: *And when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What mean the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgments, which the Lord your God hath commanded you? that thou shalt say unto thy son, We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt; and the Lord brought*

us out with a mighty hand, and shewed signs and wonders upon Pharaoh and upon Egypt, &c. Deut. vi. 20, &c. And take every man of you a stone upon his shoulder, according to the number of the tribes, that they may be a sign among you, when your children ask their fathers in time to come, saying, What mean you by these stones? that ye shall answer, The waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant, &c. Joshua vi. 3, 4, &c.

296. *Distinguish between a moral and a positive law.*

A *moral* law is that which is founded in reason, and is universally binding on the conscience, being based on those eternal principles of right which the divine law recognises and enforces.

A *positive* law relates to an observance in itself indifferent, and only binding by the authority of the lawgiver. God, as a lawgiver, enacts no positive laws without wise reasons: the multitude may not understand them; but they may be discovered, and found satisfactory, through an enlarged view of their moral tendency. But as these reasons are an after-discovery, the observance is not binding, like a moral law, antecedently to the positive enactment.

297. *In Matt. iii. 2 is the word ἤγγικε properly translated in the present tense? are there similar instances in classical writers?*

Properly speaking, the translation should be, "the kingdom of God *hath* drawn near;" as this verb is used to denote not only things approaching, but things actually present and happening. The "kingdom of heaven" here means the Gospel; and the words, *is at hand* (though less literal), were more correct, as coming from John the Baptist, the herald of our Lord. Not so in Romans xiii. 12, *The night* (of heathenism) *is far spent, the day of the Gospel is AT HAND*; of which the clearer and fuller rendering would have been, "*hath* approached." Even in English, to say of an expected guest, "he is *at hand*," is not equal to "he *hath* or *is* arrived." Of this transposition of tenses

there are examples in classical writers, particularly of passing from the past to the present tense.

—— caput extulit unda —

—— dehinc talia fatur. *Æn. lib. i.*

ἦκω, νεκρῶν κευθμῶνα καὶ σκότου πύλας

λιπών.

Eurip. *Hecuba*, lin. 1.

where ἦκω has the signification of a *past* action; not “I am in the act of coming,” but “I am come, I am here.” “Adsum atque advenio, Acheronte vix via alta atque ardua.”—Cicero, *Tusc. lib. xvi.*

298. “Ὅσαι γὰρ ἐπαγγελίαι Θεοῦ, ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ναί, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἀμήν, 2 Cor. i. 20: *translate this, and give your reason for differing from the authorised version.*

“For whatever be the promises of God, they are in him yea, and in him amen.” Not *all* the promises in *him*, for that would cast a doubt on other promises; but whatever God hath promised is *in him*, or through him, yea and amen. The ἐν αὐτῷ belongs to ναί, as it belongs to ἀμήν.*

299. *Write in Latin your sentiments on the following thesis: Christ, by his one oblation of himself once offered, made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.*

Placationis et supplicii pro peccatis necessitas in illa doctrina ingeniti peccati fundata est, quam et experientia et literæ sacræ declarant. *Experientia* quidem, quia “*aliam legem sensitivus in membris nostris, mentis legi repugnantem; adeo ut*

The necessity for a propitiation and satisfaction for transgression is founded on the doctrine of *original* and *actual* sin, which both experience and Scripture proclaim. Experience manifests it, for we feel that there is *a law in our members warring against the law in our mind; so that the things which we would, those we do not*; and we know that our actual iniquities—shoots from this deadly stem—are numberless. But the sacred Scrip-

* I find that Dr. Sisson has given a different answer to both this and the preceding question.

quæ volumus, ea non agamus;" et scimus peccata nostra, e lethali trunco germinantia, esse innumeralia. *Literæ sacræ* autem idem monstrant; quoniam declarant "per Adamam omnes moriri;" nos autem in peccato a matre progenitos fuisse, et revera neminem ne unum quidem esse quod bonum est peragentem. Quæ cum ita sint, "si Deus, et sanctus et æquus, iniquum rigide observaret;" si etiam ille Deus, nostris meritis aspectatis, judicium sumeret, ne unus quidem in gratiam cum Deo redire possit. Quo pacto igitur cum Deo adeo puro conciliandum est?

Pœnitere, et in reliquum tempus obsequi, etiam si illa obedientia reddi posset (quod quidem nullo modo fuerit), tantum ab ira jamdudum accumulata nos tueretur, non a commissuris peccatis absolvere possit. Hanc ob causam quæque natio non-

tures inform us, that *in sin did our mother conceive us*, and that *there is none that doeth good, no, not one*. Under these circumstances, if a holy and just God should be extreme to mark what is amiss, and if that God were to enter into judgment with us on the score of our own merit, no man living could be justified in his sight. How, then, shall we find reconciliation with a pure God? Repentance and obedience for the future (even if that obedience were unfailing, which it could never be), would only preserve us from an *accumulation* of the wrath already incurred; it could not be, in justice, an acquittal for the past debt. Hence, all nations have sought some propitiation—the common one being that which consists of animal sacrifices; which indeed the Almighty prescribed to the Jews, under the preparatory economy of the law, and even accepted when offered with right dispositions, and as significant emblems of a higher sacrifice, distinctly though gradually revealed as the object of faith and hope. For, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews justly reasons (x. 4), *It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin*; and even *the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean had its virtue*, by the appointment of God, in purifying the flesh from legal defilements, Heb. ix. 12. All these things were a shadow of things to come, but the body was of Christ, Col. ii. 17. Thus was the offering, which God provided of himself, to swallow up the typical sacrifices. This had been fully understood by Abel, who, by faith, offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, Heb. xi. 4;—by Cain, who knew well that, after transgression, sin, or a sin-offering, lay at his door, or was within reach (an anticipation of the law, Gen. iv. 7, Exod. xxix. 42, Levit. iv. 3, 4; Bayly's *Hebrew Bible*);—by Abraham, who saw the Messiah's day afar off, and was glad, John iii. 56;—by David, who, speaking prophetically, in the name of Christ, said (Ps. xl. 6, 7), as quoted by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, *Wherefore*

nullam placationem expetivit, quarum illa usitatio est, quæ ex victimis immolatis constat. "Nec boum autem, nec caprorum sanguis ad peccatum absolvendum per se valet, ne quidem corporis fructus primogenitus animi scelus adimere poterit." Victimæ secundum legem Judaicam institutæ, pro typis tantum fuere utiles. Deus enim donum sibi dandum comparavit, Filium suum, Dei Agnum, qui hominis peccata ablueret. "Ita enim Deus dilexit mundum, ut Filium suum unigenitum dederit, ut quisquis credit in eum non pereat, sed vita æterna fruatur." Hoc sacrificium perfectum est, et ad omne peccatum sufficit. Jesu enim sanguis nos ab omni peccato purificat: ejus vis adspæctum retrorsus habet. Typica sacrificia Judæos facientes et ethnicos non Jesum cognoscentes includit; enim Agnus est mactatus jam inde a facto mundi fundamento. Sed Christi

when he (Christ) cometh into the world, he saith (unto the Father), Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come—in the volume of thy book (in all the prophecies, institutions, and typical sacrifices of the law) it is written of me—to do thy will, O God, Heb. x. 5-7. Victims ordained according to the Jewish law were thus useful merely as types of the higher and only sacrifice; for God provided a gift to be offered to himself, his own Son, who should atone for the sins of the human race. God so loved the world (for God is love), that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. This is a perfect sacrifice, and sufficient to expiate every offence. For the blood of Jesus cleanseth us from all sin; its efficacy is retrospective, embracing such Jews as had offered typical sacrifices, and rude Gentiles, who had not heard of Jesus, but had acted up to their belief, for he is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, Rev. xiii. 8; and a man, with a willing mind, is accepted according to that he hath, and not according to that he hath not, 2 Cor. viii. 12. But in other respects the sacrifice of Christ was of more value than those of the law; for the high priest, as being himself sinful, was obliged by the Jewish law to offer up victims both for the people and for himself; but he, after he had by himself offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down at the right hand of God; so that the sacrifice of his body was not made yearly, or for one generation or individual, but once and for all men. In opposition to this clear declaration, the popish doctrine of transubstantiation asserts that Christ is still daily sacrificed, as the Jews offered a morning and evening lamb. Christ was the true Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world. As the sacrifice was more solemn on the feast of the passover, Christ our passover was sacrificed

sacrificium aliis modis plusquam legis immolationes valebat. Pontifex maximus Judæorum enim, quippe qui peccator ipse esset, et populo atque sibi secundum legem Judaicam sacrificia facere coactus est; hic vero, αἰνός, una pro peccatis oblata in perpetuum victima, consedit ad dexteram Dei. Nam non singulis annis, sed semel, et pro omnibus, ejus corporis immolatio facta est. Contra hanc denuntiationem perspicuam illud dogma papisticum, Christum adhuc quotidie immolatum prædicat. Fides Christo unit, similiter ac membra capiti; nosque servat in ecclesia, sicut ramos in arborem insertos. Cavendum est solum, ne fides nostra sterilis sit et infructuosa; neque insitor, qui palmites pampinarios (scil. Judæos) rejecit, nos quoque surcularios non parcat.

for us. As, on the great day of atonement, the *azazel*, or scape-goat, having had the sins of the people confessed on his head, was turned into the wilderness, Christ became a curse for us, and God laid on him the iniquities of us all. And as the blood of the other goat, with that of other victims, was sprinkled on the ark of the covenant by the high-priest, entering that once only in a year within the veil; so Christ was the great high-priest, and the victim, who, neither *by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us*, Heb. ix. 12. At his death the veil of the Temple was rent in twain, to shew that these mysteries of the law had all been realised; that the *chel*, or middle-wall of partition between the courts of the Gentiles and Israelites, which till then it had been death for any Gentile to pass, was broken down; that the death of Jesus had made both, i. e. Jew and Gentile, one in point of access to the Father, Eph. ii. 14, 15; and that the law of ordinances and prefigurations was, by the death of him, when he said, *It is finished*, a handwriting blotted out and nailed to the cross, Col. ii. 14. This great oblation was once offered, once for all, and therefore full, perfect, and sufficient. One of the burdens which the Jews were unable to bear, was the costliness and trouble of offering sacrifices in constant repetition; but this is now precluded, and we have only, in the blessed sacrament of the Lord's supper, a lively remembrance of it, and a spiritual participation of the body and blood of our Lord, by a faith which unites us to him as members to the head, and preserves us on the tree as engrafted branches. Let us then manifest the union of the mystical body of Christ by love to the head and members, and the healthiness of the branches by bearing much fruit; lest, if we be fruitless, he that spared not the natural branches, but cut off his people Israel, should also not spare us.

INDEX.

The figures refer to the pages.

- ABRAHAM, twofold promise to, 151 ; paid tithe to Melchizedek, 322.
- Absolution (Matt. xvi. 19), error of the Romish heresy respecting it, 40. The power to absolve imparted equally to the apostles ; in a modified degree to their successors ; power of the latter conditional, 41. Ancient form of, supplicatory ; absolute form not introduced until the 12th century, 42. Three forms of, in the English liturgy ; description of them, *ib.*
- Achaia, its boundaries, 147.
- Acts of our Lord, several omitted by St. Mark, although mentioned by Matthew and Luke ; the inference, what, 112. St. Luke an eye-witness of them, 328.
- Antinomians, their extravagance respecting indefectible grace, 52 ; their texts concerning election, *ib.*
- Antioch, several cities so named, built by the Seleucidæ ; the two principal, Antioch in Syria and in Pisidia, 39.
- Antipædobaptists baptise only adults, 56.
- Apollinarians, their opinion concerning Christ, 396.
- Apostle, the word laid aside, and *bishop* substituted, 23 ; signifies the highest ecclesiastical rank, *ib.*
- Areopagus, its etymology, account of, 60 ; its degeneracy ; Paul converts Dionysius there, *ib.*
- Arguments in proof of the divinity of our Lord, 284 ; of St. Paul, for the unity of God, and against idolatry, 215.
- Arminianism explained, 163.
- Arians, their belief ; texts used by them, 49.
- Articles of the church, in four general divisions, 158 ; first published by Henry VIII. in 1536, 295 ; of Edward VI., published in 1552, *ib.* ; of Elizabeth, in 1562, *ib.* ; revised and published in Latin and English in 1591, *ib.* ; subscription to, as binding on the clergy, 298.
- Atonement, the, its reasonableness, 65 ; a motive to obedience, 216.
- Attributes of God, natural and moral, 183.
- Authority of Scripture, 234.
- Authors, profane, confirm the facts of Gospel-history, 217.

- Baptism, infant, plea of the Antipædobaptists, 77 ; termed the circumcision of Christ, 78 ; by laymen or females, mode of baptising, 173 ; lay, not invalid, according to Fleetwood, 174 ; but excluded by articles of our religion (XXIII., XIX.), 175 ; how salvation is affected by it, *ib.* ; by a dissenting minister ; rebaptism, 175 ; giving a name at baptism ; similar heathen custom, 188. For the remission of sins ; remits in infants ; original sin, 248. Of proselytes, 249 ; in what cases the Jews baptised, 258. Of young children, 386.
- Baptists form the third branch of dissenters, the Independents and Presbyterians being the other two, 55 ; some are Sabbatarians, 56 ; John, the, compared with Elijah, 358.
- Βασιλικός* (John iv. 46), its meaning, 109.
- Being, an all-powerful, ever-present, 299.
- Belief in the power and dominion of God, necessity for, 380.
- Bethesda, pools similar to, mentioned by classic authors, 287.
- Bible, triumphant in spite of all attacks, 106 ; is an inspired composition, 286.
- Birthright, and the blessing ; amount, intention, and authority of, might be forfeited or sold ; instances of their being obtained surreptitiously, 32.
- Body of Christ, in the Lord's supper, how to be understood, 387 ; spiritually present in the eucharist, 388.
- Book, no apocryphal, exists in Hebrew, 407.
- Books of Scripture, apocryphal and canonical, 245 ; of the New Testament, some regarded for a while as of doubtful authority by the church, 278 ; of homilies, when set forth, 295 ; of the Old and New Testament, are transmitted entire and uncorrupted ; proofs of, 315. Care taken in transcribing the Old Testament, *ib.*
- Boundaries of Samaria, Galilee, Judea, 115.
- Bread, our daily, its signification, 14.
- Calvin, his doctrines, 163 ; publishes his *Institutes* at Basle (A.D. 1535), 293 ; dies in 1564, 294.
- Calvinists hold five points, an account of them, 51.
- Canon of the Old Testament Scriptures, integrity of, 409.
- Canons and homilies of the church, 229.
- constitutions ecclesiastical, when drawn up, 296.
- Cause, efficient, of man's redemption, 249.
- Celsus writes a book against Christianity, answered by Origen, 218 ; quotes the Old and New Testament, 219.
- Ceremony of the Jews on the admission of a proselyte, 118.
- Christ, his genealogy ; Joseph held to be his legal father, 30 ; pedigree

- of the Virgin Mary traced, 31 ; Christ without sin, 44 ; his wisdom, 62 ; compared with the impostor Mahomet, 63 ; his advent and its consequences, why not more distinctly revealed in the Jewish Scriptures, 141 ; denied to be the Messiah, on what grounds, 343 ; his pre-existence proved, 360.
- Christianity, its divine origin proved, 17 ; proved from various sources, 18 ; a comprehension of all its doctrines not necessary to a belief in it, 25 ; the divine origin of, assumed, to prove the divine original of the Mosaic dispensation, 108 ; the same in substance which the apostles promulgated, 113 ; obstinacy of the Jews and Gentiles no objection to the truth of, 125 ; necessity of, to temporal happiness, 269 ; silence of learned heathens concerning, 186 ; reasons why it was opposed by the pagan world, 383.
- Christians, divisions among, 129 ; evil effects of, 131 ; the Judaising, 133.
- Church, the articles of our, their publication and authority, 9 ; where before Luther, 85 ; whether a parliament church, *ib.* ; articles of the, in four general divisions, 158 ; Church of England and that of Rome compared, 159 ; belief in the holy Catholic Church, 221 ; what necessary to its members, 222 ; its comprehensiveness, *ib.* ; the Roman Catholic Church, no claim to the title *holy*, 226 ; derivation of the word *church*, 300 ; its unity proved, 317 ; its government, the leading forms of, 351.
- Cities, Levitical, 321.
- Clause, *he descended into hell*, discussed, 230.
- Commandments, morality of the ten, 134.
- Communion of saints, the belief in, explained, 250.
- Confession of faith, what, 175.
- Corinthians, a passage from, translated, 308 ; 1 Cor. vii. 31, sense of the word *καταχρόμενοι*, 424 ; 2 Cor. i. 20, translated, 435.
- Covenant, a national, how to be established, 429 ; of God with the Jews, *ib.* ; spiritual blessings of, 430.
- Councils of the Jews, 88.
- Creation, its various meanings, 21.
- Creed, Athanasian, not written by Athanasius, 135 ; heresies condemned by it, 136 ; difficult expressions in, 139.
- Creeds, the three, 214.
- Criteria of true miracles, applied to the chief ones in the New Testament, 347 ; and to those of Moses and Joshua, 349.
- Cross, inscription on the, 144 ; bearing the cross, 375.
- Crucifixion, why inflicted on Christ, 144 ; the darkness at, 163 ; the crucified not interred by the Romans, 377.

- Dates of the principal epochs in the Testament histories, 33.
 Day begun after the evening by the Hebrews, 335.
 Days, Jewish, sacred and civil, 43.
 Deacons and presbyters, when ordained; their powers, 54.
 Death of our Lord necessary, 146.
 Decrees irrespective are visionary and delusive, 289.
 Deist, reply to a, in vindication of the miracles recorded by Moses, 257.
 Demoniacs did not labour under mental disease, 60.
Δὰ τοῦς ἀγγέλους (1 Cor. xi. 10), explanation of, 20.
 Dialect of the New Testament, 87.
 Divinity of our Lord, arguments proving the, 284; of each person of the Trinity shewn, 428.
 Doctrine, Mohammedan, fallacy of, 184; its cunning, and want of miracles, 185; the Socinian, unscriptural, 424; some doctrines of the Gospel in parables only, 264.
 Dominion of God, implicit belief in, necessary, 380.
 Ears, penetration of, 33.
 Egypt, the flight into, fulfils a prophecy, 37; an explanation of the prophecy of Hosea, 38.
 Election, visionary and delusive, 289.
 Elias, called Elijah, 357; his character, actions, and mode of life, compared with those of John the Baptist, 358.
 Embalming, a Jewish custom, borrowed from the Egyptians, 377.
 Ember-weeks, stated seasons for fasting, 167.
 Enoch, book of, found in Abyssinia by Bruce, 408.
 Episcopacy, its attributes and functions; is of divine authority, 22; its principle, 23.
 Epistle, the first, of St. John, 308.
 Errors of Socinianism and Sabellianism, 426.
 Evangelists, authenticity of their books, 15; their different accounts of the crucifixion reconcileable, 90.
 Evidence, external, concerning the mission of our Saviour, 171.
 Evidences for the truth of revelation, 279.
 Evil, origin of, natural and moral, 16; God's prevention of, not consistent with man's free-agency, 17; origin of, a difficulty in natural religion, 70; moral remedy for, in Christ, 282.
 Execution, place of, among the Jews, 376.
 Executioners, Burton wrong in his derivation, 38.
 Existence of a God, Grotius' proof of, 270.
 Ezekiel named *son of man*, as well as Christ, 45.

- Facts, the, of Gospel-history, confirmed by profane authors, 217.
- Faith, justification by, its precise meaning, 301 ; faith and science, distinction between, 300 ; faith and belief, divine and human, definition, 13 ; confession of, 175.
- Fallacy of the Roman Catholics respecting purgatory, 378 ; their false reasoning on a passage in Corinthians, *ib.* ; their twofold error, 379 ; a refutation of, 380.
- Fathers of the Christian church, a sketch of, 369.
- Figs, exportation of, unlawful in Athens in times of scarcity ; informers against exporters, 343.
- Flute in common use at funerals, 233.
- Free-will, human, 290.
- Galilee, boundaries of, 36 ; prophecy of Christ's preaching first there, 37.
- Gamaliel, Paul studies at his feet, 3.
- Gemara, Talmud, and Mishna, what, 256.
- Genealogies, a custom of the Jews respecting, 31.
- Geology, researches in, inimical to faith, 179 ; and preface.
- Ghost, Holy, divinity of the, 46.
- Gifts, miraculous, what they were, 358 ; to whom restricted, 359.
- God, natural and moral attributes of, 183 ; St. Paul's arguments for the unity of, 215 ; proofs that there can only be one, 329 ; proved to be omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent, 418.
- Godhead, one, plurality of persons in, 21 ; his eternal duration, 170 ; benevolence of, 172 ; his bounties to mankind, 173.
- Goods, community of, not enforced by the apostles, 288 ; articles of the church on this point, *ib.*
- Gospel, St. Matthew's, Hebrew and Greek, an account of, 1 ; where first preached in Europe, *ib.* ; of St. Matthew has more references to Jewish customs than the others, 11 ; of St. John, in what it differs from the others, 391 ; Gospel-history, considerations proving the truth of the, 240 ; some doctrines of, in parables only, 264 ; its rapid progress proved from the book of Acts, 309.
- Gospels, their authenticity, 14 ; striking difference between them and the Koran, 64.
- Grace and holiness, 216 ; redemption by Christ a part of the doctrine of grace, 217 ; irresistible, what is understood by it, 289 ; habitual, the meaning of, 389.
- Grotius, his proof of the existence of a God, 270.
- Happiness, Christianity necessary to temporal, 269.

- Harmony of the Scriptures proves their divine authority, 304.
- Hebraisms (in Eph. i. 22), 151.
- Hebrew language, a peculiarity of, exemplified, 148; *Hebrew of the Hebrews*, this idiom explained, 319; Hebrew hymns of praise, ancient instances of, 355.
- Hell, what meant by, 231.
- Henry VIII. a reformer only in a few points, 294.
- Heresy, two senses of, 193; its meaning in England, 194; Gnostic, Manichæan, and Pelagian, 366.
- Herod was troubled* (Matt. ii. 3), reflections on this passage, 190.
- Herod the Great, genealogy of; division of his kingdom, 342.
- High-priest, in the plural, as applied to Annas and Caiaphas, 107.
- Historical books of the New Testament, 327.
- History, Jewish, dates of the principal events, until the birth of Christ, 123; Gospel, the facts of, confirmed by profane authors, 217; a brief, of the reformation, 291; boldness and success of Luther, and book written against him by Henry VIII., 292, 294.
- Holy of holies, the sanctuary, the court of the Temple, 78.
- Ghost, proved truly God, 394; opinions of different sects concerning the, 396; texts quoted, *ib.*; personality of, 425.
- Homilies and canons, an account of them, 229; books of, when set forth, 295.
- House, a Jewish, described at length, 324.
- Jesus, or Joshua, the name common among the Jews, but the Saviour is distinguished as Christ, 12; inhospitality of the Samaritans to, 238.
- Jews, the punishments of, 338; some of them enumerated, 340.
- Idiom, an, of the Jews explained, 319.
- Idolatry, St. Paul's arguments against, 215.
- Image of God, man created in the, 240.
- Immersion in baptism, denied by the church, 56.
- Independents, opinions of the; texts cited by them, 54; character of, 354.
- Inspiration, prophetic, evidence of, 67; of the Scriptures, its kind and degree, 228; criterion of, 286; reasonable and necessary, 305.
- John (v. 2), his style of narrative proves him a Jew, 287; first epistle of, not addressed to any church, 308; xxv. 18, observation on, 360; xii. 28, 29, translated from English into Greek, 374; i. 15, testimony alluded to there, when given, 378; the Baptist, when his imprisonment took place, 319.
- Irvingites are millennarian fanatics, 59.

- Israel, sojourn of the children of, in Egypt, 227.
 Judas the traitor, the sum paid him, in what coin, 385.
 Julian treats of the first chapter of St. John, 219.
Jus Quiritium, the privilege of, claimed by St. Paul, 338.
 Justification by faith and good works, 301.
- Kingdom of God, or kingdom of heaven, 122; kingdom of Herod the Great, its division, 242.
 Knox, John, 294.
- Language of the New Testament, 228.
 Law of Moses, respect of our Lord for, 129.
 — Levitical, 220; law, a general, established in the creation, 301; throughout all generations, what meant by, 429; of Moses, intent of its ordinances, 433; distinction between a moral and a positive, 434.
 Learning of St. Paul in typical matters, 432.
 Letter, Sunday, and golden number, explained, 126.
 Levites, the offices held by them; carried arms in time of war, 322; musical, *ib.*
 Life and death, power of the Jews over, at the time of the crucifixion, 235.
 Liturgy, the, whether taken from the mass-book, 85; on an established precomposed one, 168; its advantages, *ib.*; indispensable to public worship, 169; its history, 296; the present compared with that used before the reformation, 345; tenderness of the first reformers in altering the, *ib.*
 Lord, divinity of our, proofs of, 284; his address to the eleven in Jerusalem, 334; Lord's supper, the, 251.
 Luke, St., relates *several* of Christ's miracles; only *one* related by all the four evangelists, 12; wrote the Acts as a journal, 30; v. 19, illustrated by describing a Jewish house, 150.
 Luther, his doctrines, 165.
- Mahomet artfully changes a prophecy, 319.
 Mahommedanism professes the unity of God, 319.
 Mankind, the necessity of a revelation to, 411.
 Manna, the real derivation of the word, 258.
 Manuscript discovered at Milan, 113.
 Matthew (xvi. 26), three interpretations of, 237; v. 13, and three following, translated into Latin, 253; xvi. 14, 17, translated into Latin, 303; xv. 35, on the common translation of, 385; xxvi. 64, part of, explained, 390; iii. 2, remark on, 434.

- Means by which the sons of men are sanctified, 283.
- Men, inspired, how obtaining authority, 299.
- Messiah, the time of his appearance foretold, 10; proofs of such a deliverer being expected, 11; prophesied by the Sibylline books, 20; some of the prophecies noticed, 109; Old Testament predictions of, harmonise, 195; ancient prophecies of in the Old Testament alluded to in the New, 197; a double Messiah expected by the Jews, 232; Christ denied to be the Messiah, on what grounds, 343; gross expectations of the Jews, 344; their reasons for rejecting, 345.
- Messias, the, already come, 271; Ben Joseph and Ben David, 403.
- Methodists, the, their tenets, 57; the Wesleyan, texts used by them, 58.
- Millennarians, the, their belief, 59.
- Ministers, classes of, before the resurrection, their offices, 117.
- Miracles of Christ, 12; and prophecies, their difference, 37; why not of frequent occurrence, 74; our Lord's at Cana and Capernaum, 110; the criterion of a miracle applied to Christ's, 121; a communication of supernatural power, 211; recorded by Moses, vindicated, 257; the proper design and effect of, 302; the criteria of true, on application of, 347.
- Mishna, the, or second law, 81; Talmud and Gemara, what, 256.
- Money, values of a denarius, shekel, mina, and drachma, 335.
- changers, how they came into the Temple, 143.
- Monument, what, among some ancient nations, 104.
- Moravians, admissions and practice of, 50.
- Mountains, the principal ones of Palestine, 335.
- Mysteries in religion, their twofold sense, &c., 27.
- Number, golden, and Sunday-letter, explained, 126.
- Obedience, the atonement a motive to, 216.
- Officers, called hyperetai, basanistai, and practores, their duties, 306.
- Offices assigned to the Levites, 322.
- Omnipotence of God, arguments in proof of, 418; how seen; the existence of evil no disproof of, 419.
- Omnipresence of God implies his omniscience, 422.
- Omniscience of God, 420; proved by Scripture, 421; and veracity of God, 328.
- Onesimus, a slave, finds Paul in Rome, 8.
- Oratories, Jewish, differed from the synagogues, 400.
- Ordinances of the law of Moses, the peculiar intention of, 433.
- Ordination, the power to ordain, how and when conferred, 23.
- Origen, a sketch of, 370.
- Origin, divine, of the Scripture proved, 304.

- Paine, Thomas, an illiterate egotist, 209.
- Paracletos, its different senses in the New Testament, 252.
- Parallel between Elias and John, 212.
- Party, high church, opinion of the, 223.
- Passover, the, when instituted, 265; Jewish celebration of, 266; of the New Testament, the Lord's supper, 267.
- Paul, St., life and writings of, chronologically arranged, 3; his adventure at Philippi, 5; his epistle to the Galatians; restores Eutychus to life, 6; rescued by Lysias; declares himself a Pharisee, 7; wrecked at Melita, 8; epistle to the Hebrews, *ib.*; second epistle to Timothy, 9; a summary of his qualifications for the office of apostle, 26; his fight with wild beasts at Ephesus figurative, 38; free citizenship of Rome, 39; was a bishop in the strictest sense, 55; the expediency of his conduct, 242; leniency with the unconverted Jews, 243; his rhetorical acumen, 244; skill against assailants, 245; his directions on various subjects, 332; suffers martyrdom, 26.
- Pentateuch, the authenticity of, established by reference to profane authors, 177; a passage from Sir Wm. Jones, 178; quotation from Josephus, 179; also from Dr. Graves, 180; undoubtedly the genuine work of Moses, 183; the supplemental passages not written by Moses, 207; the Samaritan Pentateuch, 310.
- Personality, the triple in one nature, shewn, 426.
- Pharisees, an account of the sect, 79; their unholiness, 199.
- Phylacteries, 254; called Tephillim, worn by all Jews, 255.
- Pilate, Pontius, life and death of, 36; his hesitating character, 99.
- Pillar and stay of the truth* (1 Tim. iii. 15), meaning of these words, 381.
- Polycarp, a sketch of, 369.
- Prayer, our Lord's, by whom composed, 307.
- Prayers, extemporary, whether used by the Jews, 167.
- Predestination, unconditional, believed by the Calvinists, 81.
- Pre-existence of Christ proved against the Socinians, 427.
- Presbyterians, what doctrine they maintain, 53.
- Presbyters and deacons, when ordained, 54.
- Procurators, Roman, 336; their power, 337.
- Promise to Abraham twofold, 151.
- Propagation of Christianity, 274; its difficulties, 275.
- Propagators of Christianity, the early, description of, 401; their perseverance, 402; success through miracles, 404.
- Prophecies proving Jesus to be the Messiah, 109; of the Old Testament, to what they relate, 210.

- Prophecy, an important, unwittingly fulfilled, 377.
- Prophets, the greater and lesser, 110; the four greater, chronologically arranged, and the circumstances stated under which their prophecies were delivered, 153; the twelve minor, arranged in three classes, 226.
- Proselytes of the temple and of the gate, 73; converts to Judaism so called, 74; baptised by the Jews, 258.
- Proselytism, the difference between children born before or after the baptism of their parents, 79.
- Providence, a particular, 71.
- Psalm the 24th, on what occasion composed, 321.
- Publicans and sinners, why joined, 61; publicans disreputable among the Jews, 194; noble in dignity in Judea, 195; chiefs among, their importance, 16; usually Romans of the equestrian order, 61.
- Punishments among the Jews, description of, 338.
- Purgatory, fallacy of the Roman Catholics concerning, 338.
- Quakers oppose all external symbols, 57.
- Qualifications, what, necessary to judge of religious matters, 415.
- Question asked by the Jews of John the Baptist, 213.
- Rachel, how connected with Rama in Bethlehem, 300.
- Reasoning *à priori* and *à posteriori* on the existence of God, 82.
- Redemption of man, the efficient and final causes of, 249.
 ———, the procuring cause or principle of, 316.
- Regeneration and habitual grace, their meaning, 389; Burnet's explanation of, 392.
- Religion, natural and revealed, both equally mysterious, 68; the state of, among the Greeks and Romans, 261.
- Resurrection, purposes of our Lord's remaining on earth for forty days after, and before his ascension, 132; testimony of the apostles on; a fact stated by Paley, 272.
- Revelation, evidences of the truth of, 279; a revolution in the welfare of mankind achieved by it, 280; necessity of an extraordinary, to mankind, 411.
- Rome, the church of, tampers with the commandments, 239.
- Rubrics and articles of the church, an account of, 229.
- Sabbath-day, works of the, 276.
- Sabbaths of the Jews, various, 190.
- Sabbatical year, 191.
- Sabbath of sabbaths, 192; high festivals called sabbaths, 193.

- Sacrifice, difference between and a rite, 227.
- Saints, distinction between, 166.
- Samaritans refuse our Lord hospitality, 260.
- Sanctuary, a description of the, 78.
- Sanhedrim, the, described, 149.
- Scripture, canon of, when authoritatively settled, 87; the first principle on which its authority depends, 234; books of, canonical and apocryphal, 245; genuineness and authenticity of, 310.
- Scriptures, the holy, are not of modern contrivance, 112; nor the invention of man, 350.
- Sects, the principal religious, of present times, distributed into classes, 49; enumerated and described, 51-59; in the time of the apostles, 199; enumerated and described, 200-206.
- Sedition, Roman punishment for, 49.
- Seniores plebis* and *primus inter pares* explained, 283.
- Sense, the moral, 24.
- Septuagint, an account of the, 128.
- Sepulchre, described according to the Rabbins, 102; observation on our Saviour's, 103.
- Sibylline prophecies, not mentioned by sacred writers, 20.
- Sibyls, an account of them, 19.
- Socinians allow no pre-existence to Christ before his birth, 50.
- Soul, immortality of the, 72.
- Southcotians and millennarian fanatics, 59.
- State, a future, proved by the nature and capacity of the soul, 72-75.
- Statute, a, for ever, its meaning, 429.
- Stoning to death, to what crimes decreed, 42.
- Swine, alleged injustice to the owner of the, 60.
- Swedenborgians, the, have revived the Sabellian heresy, 50.
- Sycophant, whence the epithet is derived, 343.
- Synagogues of the Jews, their officers, and their functions, 88; of the New Testament, 120.
- Talmud described, 256.
- Temple at Jerusalem, question respecting Gentile worship there, 143; captain of the, his rank and authority, 398.
- Temples, description of the first and second, 311; difference between them, 314, 342.
- Temptation, lead us not into*, explained, 9.
- Tertullian, a sketch of, 332.
- Testament, books of the New, arranged in three classes and in chronological order, 2; silence of, on the subject of infant baptism, 64;

- dialect of, 87 ; the genuineness of, essential, 327 ; their superiority over spurious imitations, 409.
- Testimony to the sufferings of the early Christians, 234.
- Theatrical representations, had the Jews any? 111.
- Theology, natural, excellencies and defects of Paley's, 361.
- Thesis on the oblation of Christ, written in Latin, 435.
- Timothy placed by St. Paul in Ephesus as bishop, 55 ; his history ; Paul's affection for him, 414.
- Tithes given before the time of Moses, 322.
- Titus, a bishop in Crete, 55.
- Tongues, speaking with, 333.
- Transfiguration, our Lord's, 35.
- Translation of 1 Cor. iv. 9 from the Greek, 308.
- Transmigration of souls believed by the Pharisees, 213.
- Transubstantiation, texts against, 389.
- Tribe of Levi, how divided, 320.
- Triclinium, the Roman, described, 327.
- Trinity, Persian, Hindoo, and Egyptian vestiges of, 22 ; creed of the Christian church concerning the, 29 ; syllogisms proving the Trinity in unity, 29 ; Trinity described, 81 ; eternity an attribute of the, 189.
- Unity of the holy catholic church proved, 317.
- Universalists, their opinion of divine punishment, 52.
- Value of a denarius, shekel, mina, and drachma, 335.
- Veracity and omniscience of God, 328.
- Version, English, of John, xii. 28, 29, translated into Greek, 374.
- Vindication of the miracles recorded by Moses, 257.
- Watches, the Jewish night divided into three ; a fourth introduced in the time of our Saviour ; Burton's opinion controverted, 44.
- Water of separation, what appointed for, the ceremonial, 65.
—— and the Holy Spirit, 330.
- Weeks, ember, ordinations take place in the, 167.
——, the Sabbath of, in the Pentecost, 324.
- Wine mixed with frankincense, when used, called myrrhed wine by St. Mark, 375 ; remarks on, 376.
- Works of the Sabbath-day, Sabbath-day's journey, 276 ; what works allowed, 277.
- Worship, the Jewish contrasted with the Samaritan, 259 ; religious, Jewish places of, 398.
- Writers, heathen, the value of their testimony, 234.

Writings, apocryphal, their probable origin, 407 ; many spurious, containing fictions written by the Gnostics, 408.

Xenophon and Caesar mention themselves in the third person, as do Moses and St. Matthew, 310.

Year, the civil, among the Jews, 12 ; the sacred, 13 ; the sabbatical, land left uncultivated in, 322 ; why called the year of release, 323 ; of jubilee, commenced after seven sabbatical years, 323.

Zaleucus, king of the Locrians, story of, 67.

Zerubbabel builds the second temple, 399.

Zuinglius preaches the Reformation at Zurich, is slain, and succeeded by Bullinger, 293.

THE END.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY ROBSON, LEVEY, AND FRANKLYN,
46 St. Martin's Lane.











